

555. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., relative to highways, etc.; to the Committee on Roads.

556. Also, petition of W. Burton & Co., New York, N. Y., relative to certain sections of House bill 5033; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

557. Also, petition of William Gregg, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

558. Also, petition of Milner Bros. (Inc.), Brooklyn, N. Y., urging duty on greeting cards, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

559. By Mr. MALONEY: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Lawrence, Mass., against the use by France of colored troops in the occupied districts of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

560. Also, petition of the Council Ste. Victoire, South Lawrence, Mass., and Council Jacques Cartier, Lynn, Mass., against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

561. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Federal Employees' Union No. 1, National Federation of Federal Employees, of San Francisco, urging support of House bill 2429; to the Committee on Labor. Letter from World Metric Standardization Council, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing House bill 10; to the Committee on Weights and Measures. Telegram from Automobile Club of Southern California, indorsing Senate bill 1072; to the Committee on Roads. Telegram from Division No. 415, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Roseville, Calif., against any sales or turnover tax, and indorsing progressive taxation of large incomes, estates, and excess profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

562. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Association of Commerce, Minot, N. Dak., and Argonne Post, No. 85, of the American Legion, Beulah, N. Dak., urging the passage of legislation for the relief of disabled service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

563. Also, concurrent resolution by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, petitioning Congress to request the Joint International Commission to call a conference for the purpose of taking action for the control of the floods of the Red River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

564. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the Utica, N. Y., Trades Assembly, indorsing relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

565. By Mr. TEMPLE: Resolution of the Board of Education of the Fallowfield School District, Washington County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

566. Also, petition of the McKenna Brass & Manufacturing Co. (Inc.), Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 4981; to the Committee on Agriculture.

567. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of Clayton J. Walker, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

568. Also, petition of Rudolph W. Battershell, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

569. Also, petition of Maurice M. Daniels, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

570. Also, petition of Samuel B. Deardorff, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

571. Also, petition of Vernon G. Killian, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

572. Also, petition of W. C. Wreight, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

573. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Bay State Division, No. 413, Order of Railway Conductors, urging the repeal of the excess-profit tax, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

574. Also, petition of citizens of Roxbury and Boston, Mass., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

575. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of the Westfield, Mass., Medical Society, against the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

576. By Mr. VARE: Petition of annual convention Episcopal Church, asking for international agreement for disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 10, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, May 9, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	McLean	Shortridge
Borah	Harrell	McNary	Simmons
Broussard	Harris	Moses	Smith
Bursum	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Calder	Heflin	New	Stanfield
Cameron	Johnson	Newberry	Sterling
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Sutherland
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Townsend
Colt	Kellogg	Norris	Trammell
Culberson	Kendrick	Oddie	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kenyon	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Keyes	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	King	Phipps	Warren
Edge	Knox	Pittman	Watson, Ga.
Ernst	Ladd	Poinceter	Watson, Ind.
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Fletcher	Lenroot	Randall	Willis
France	McCormick	Reed	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	
Glass	McKellar	Sheppard	
Gooding	McKinley	Shields	

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is unavoidably absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARRIS presented a resolution of the Savannah Paint Club, of Savannah, Ga., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Harrison naval stores bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Georgia, remonstrating against any revision of the tariff on those classes of coal-tar products that are used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants, etc., generally used by farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Chicago Hide, Fur & Wool House (Inc.), of Douglas, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation imposing a protective tariff on wool and wool products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Marietta, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1073, for the relief of Lewis Clarke Lucas (now a lieutenant colonel on the retired list of the Marine Corps), and placing him on the active list in the grade of colonel, to take rank next after Theodore Porter Kane, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a resolution adopted by the Adjutants General Association of the United States, in special session at Washington, D. C., on March 15, 1921, favoring the enactment of legislation amending certain sections of the national defense act, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, pertaining to the National Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions of Local No. 2042, Bellview Farmers' Union, of Kincaid, and Local No. 843, Farmers' Union, of Marysville, Kans., protesting against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax law and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of Auxiliary Post No. 203, American Legion, of Montezuma, and Earl C. Gormley Post, No. 45, American Legion, of Junction City, both in the State of Kansas, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Shiawassee County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Perry, Mich., praying for the enactment of the so-called Volstead supplemental prohibition enforcement bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions of auxiliary of Carl O. Weaver Post, No. 194, of Petoskey; Council No. 389, Knights of Colum-

bus, of Grand Rapids; Triangle Club, of Grand Rapids; Peter Gedda Post, No. 27, American Legion, of Bessemer; Business Girls' Club, of South Haven; Godfrey Anderson Post, No. 43, American Legion, of Stephenson; Post No. 147, American Legion, of Northville; Kiwanis Club, of Jackson; Albert V. Braden Post, No. 58, American Legion, of Ishpeming; Charles A. Learned Post, No. 1, American Legion, of Detroit; Chamber of Commerce of Traverse City; Civic and Commercial Association, of Sault Ste. Marie; William Regan Post, No. 127, American Legion, of Marine City; Benton Harbor Post, No. 105, American Legion, of Benton Harbor; and Patrick Leo Hanlon Post, No. 55, American Legion, of Albion, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1711) to create the Federal land bank revolving fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1712) for the relief of Alfred P. Reck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1713) to incorporate the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1714) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Portland Co., of Portland, Me., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWBERRY:

A bill (S. 1715) for the relief of the heirs of Almon R. Proctor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1716) to appropriate \$100,000 for the survey of public lands in Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 1717) for the relief of James Gilroy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1718) authorizing the distribution of abandoned or forfeited tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes to hospitals maintained by the United States for the use of present or former members of the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

#### PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks of April 29 a copy of the resolution which I was then discussing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Maryland will be granted.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2435) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent the dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, understanding that under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will vote to-morrow on the pending so-called emergency tariff bill, I wish to take this opportunity to make a very few observations concerning the bill and its supposed effect on the economic condition of the country. When a similar bill was before the Senate in the last Congress I voted against the measure and endeavored to make clear at that time on the floor of the Senate my reasons for that vote. I propose to vote for the pending measure, but I must say very frankly that I shall not do so with any great amount of enthusiasm, as I do not feel that the measure will be of the benefit that its sponsors hope it will be; neither do I believe that it is a proper method through which to approach a solution of the pending economic difficulties.

I shall vote for the measure because, as I say, it has been improved since I voted against it in the last Congress. One of the improvements, I might say in passing, is the fact that it will be in effect only 6 months, whereas the original measure provided for 10 months. In this case the proverbial inch is far better than the ell. More important, however, in my judgment, is the new feature known as the antidumping provision, which provides in some measure for a policy that I believe this Congress or some Congress in the very near future will necessarily adopt, and that is the policy of more or less bargaining

in considering tariff impositions of a more or less elastic nature. For, in view of the situation that America is facing with reference to world trade to-day, no copper-riveted tariff measure can be made beneficial to America, or practical or practicable. Above all, I hope I may not be confronted later with a tariff bill of the "Chinese wall" nature.

Again, in balancing advantages against possible disadvantages I feel constrained to vote for the bill because of the provision of some meed of protection to American chemical and dye manufacturing industries. I believe that, irrespective of the opposition which I have read or heard voiced on the floor of the Senate against it, to be along the original line of protection to infant industries which, as I understand it, was the inception of a protective policy as the approved policy of the United States. The dye and chemical industry is certainly an infant industry, born of the necessities of the war, and now entitled, by the very fact of its birth and existence, to nourishment that will sustain it and stimulate its growth. Especially is it entitled to a very large measure of protection in view of the source of its greatest competition.

Again, as I view it, there is even in legislation something psychological, as it were. We have talked so much to the farmers and to others supposed to be benefited, about the emergency tariff bill, and it has been exploited so much in the public press, editorially and otherwise, that I believe a failure to pass the bill at this time might have a moral effect which might be even more disastrous than the conditions we are now facing.

So, taking it all in all I believe that, unattractive as the bill is from many standpoints, it is wisdom and the best policy, balancing all these viewpoints, to have it enacted into law. What is writ is writ; would it were worthier.

With that general explanation—

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from New Jersey has been a very consistent advocate of policies that would obtain foreign trade, and the bill which bears his name I think is calculated to expand the foreign commerce of the United States. The Senator does not desire to take a back track, does he, and see measures enacted which would nullify his bill and interfere with the United States obtaining trade and commerce, to that extent increasing the prosperity of the American manufacturer and the American people?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me, I am going to reach that very thought, and I will take great pleasure, I would tell the distinguished Senator from Utah, in explaining my viewpoint as to where the measures conflict. Having briefly summarized the reasons why I think even one who is convinced that the future prosperity of this country depends absolutely on developing foreign trade as well as domestic trade may vote for the pending bill, I want to take the time of the Senate for a brief space in stating what I think will be real, effective measures to remedy the condition which we are all facing in this country to-day. I never believe in offering criticism without at the same time suggesting a constructive remedy.

I believe, as I have said, that because of the shortness of the period of operation of the pending bill; because of the psychological effect, perhaps, of it becoming a law; because of its antidumping feature, which for the first time introduces somewhat elastic or bargain tariff, to the principle of which I absolutely adhere, and because of other features, the benefits to be derived from it may overbalance the disadvantages. I think I have made that clear. For that reason, and for that reason alone, I am going to vote for the bill to-morrow.

But, Mr. President, I am convinced that there is just one way to solve the difficulties facing not only America but the entire world to-day. It is time for us to emerge from emergencies and to recognize that after two and a half years following the World War a period has arrived when we should consider the enactment of permanent legislation, permanent relief, to meet conditions which we must know by a calm investigation of the situation are existing in business and on the farms to-day; to meet that situation as it exists and not try artificially to build structures which we can not think for one moment will actually solve the difficulty, for they will not.

I believe absolutely in a protective tariff system. I do not have to discuss that, I am sure, at this time. I believe in it from the standpoint of representing the difference between a proper cost and a proper profit to the American people in the production of goods here in competition with other parts of the world. I do not, however, believe in it from the standpoint of raising prices to the height of an embargo that keeps our goods entirely within our own country, raises prices to ourselves, and does not, as a matter of real results, increase the market



of the producer abroad. I repeat, it is time for us to emerge from emergencies and try to devise and pass permanent legislation. I shall try to follow that thought very briefly, because I do not believe in discussing difficulties and conditions without at least suggesting what one thinks may be a remedy.

We need, in my judgment, two things in order to bring about permanent relief—confidence at home and the extension of credit abroad. I think we have to some extent contributed toward bringing about credit abroad by the passage of the act to which the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] referred a short time ago, which will enable us to sell goods abroad.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. REED. How about markets abroad?

Mr. EDGE. When I speak of credit abroad it carries with it, of course, markets. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, because that is the word. When I say we must develop confidence at home and extend credit abroad, there is just one thing that is more important, in my judgment, than the railroad question, than the merchant-marine question, and all the other questions—for they are incidental to it—and that is markets. If we have a market abroad and a market at home, we shall settle our railroad difficulty; we shall settle our merchant-marine difficulty; we shall have goods to transport, because, of course, with a market we must produce goods and these goods must be transported.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. How does the Senator from New Jersey expect to improve our foreign market by the passage of the pending bill?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have already discussed the merits of this particular bill. I am now discussing what I believe will be a possible means of improving the markets here, and if the Senator from Ohio will permit me—I am delighted to see that he is interested, and I know his broad view of these matters—I will reach that point as rapidly as possible.

Confidence at home and markets abroad; yes. They will automatically settle most of the economic ills of the country to-day. How are we going to secure confidence at home? I do not think it is difficult to get markets abroad; I think we are on the proper path to do it. Confidence at home, in my judgment, will not be secured in any great measure by the passage of the pending bill, may I say to the Senator from Ohio. It may be helped; I hope it will be; but confidence at home will be brought about to a great extent by a revision of the present revenue and tax system of this country, and, as I see it, in no other way. In other words, one may talk about it all he wishes, he may discuss it from an academic and every other standpoint, but we can not pass legislation that will compel the man who has money, enterprise, energy, and brains to go out and do things unless he is going to reap a reasonable return for his energy and for the chances which he takes. I say without any hesitation that we must get at the root of the evil rather than pick about the branches and cut off one dead twig at a time. We must get at the foundation of this trouble rather than to tinker with the superstructure somewhere. The foundation, the root of the trouble to-day, is just that one thing—lack of confidence on the part of the men who have done things in this country in the past, and who, in my judgment, would do them again if they could see a reasonable opportunity to make a proper profit on their energy and on the risk assumed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if there is not another element that goes to the root of the question, and whether or not that is not the wage question?

Mr. EDGE. I consider the wage question a very important part, a most important part, but even the wage question to a great extent, I maintain, is not the crux of the situation. Wages are gradually coming down, as we ascertain from the newspapers and from the reports that come to us. The economic value of each individual must undergo deflation just as the value of the commodity he helps to produce must shrink in the process of deflation. The process of deflation has been a very painful and a very long process, and we can not in a way wonder at that, because men are naturally unwilling to give up

advantages which they obtained in abnormal times. Each wants all prices to come down except the price of the commodity which he has himself for sale, whether it be diamonds or shoe laces or the labor of his hands. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that the wage question is mighty important, but still I say that it is above the root and the foundation of the real question, which is national confidence. So long as we maintain a taxing system embracing, for instance, the excess-profits tax and a surtax reaching up to a maximum of 70 per cent, just so long will we discourage the average man from using his energy, his enterprise, and his capital, thus employing labor and radiating happiness and contentment throughout the land.

I know the question is immediately thought of, if not asked, "Do you believe that men who make money or who otherwise enjoy large incomes should not pay their full proportion of the running expenses of the Government?" I believe they should pay their full proportion of the running expenses of the Government, but there are other and better methods of taxation by which to make them pay. There is no reason in the world, in my opinion—and present conditions certainly bear me out—for charging one man, for instance, a 70 per cent surtax and then feel that you are not charging the average man, the working-man, so called, any tax, because the workingman, so called, to-day is not employed, as the Senator from South Dakota has indicated. It is very much better, it seems to me, to have a smaller surtax, so that the man who employs may feel that he can make a reasonable profit and thus to assure employment for labor of all kinds, for labor will be very much happier, even if it has to bear a small taxation, when it has money with which to pay than not to be employed and not to have any incomes with which to buy anything, which apparently is the situation we are to some extent facing to-day. For what shall it profit a man to have his tax bill reduced to a nickel if he has neither money nor employment on which to be taxed or with which to pay his taxes? So, while not favoring any proposition to relieve the man of wealth, the man of large income, of any proper part of his burden in contributing toward the running expenses of the Government, I believe to-day that it is absolutely essential, if we are going to solve the railroad question, which au fond is a matter of not having freight to transport; if we are going to solve the merchant-marine difficulty, which is a matter of not having cargoes to take across the seas; if we are going to solve the unemployment question, which is a matter of not having employment because we have not the market—and we can not, of course, encourage production if there is not a market for the goods produced—I believe to-day that if we are going to solve these problems we must encourage the American business man, the American farmer, the American producer, the ranchman, the cattleman—I do not care what his particular activity is—and give him the assurance that there is going to be an opportunity for him to develop his business without handicap and without penalty for his enterprise. In that event he will pay his taxes in the shape of a larger corporation tax, if you want, or of some other type of tax, but not under that insidious form of taxation such as the excess-profits tax, which discourages men from using the opportunities presented to them and which leaves them in doubt as to the possibilities of any enterprise into which they may enter.

That, in my judgment, is a question that this Congress should take up promptly, because we will not see a very decided return to business activity until some incentive is afforded the men representing every part of the country who have contributed so much to the welfare of the Nation. I do not mean alone men living in New York City or in New York State; I mean the ranchmen in the West, the small manufacturers, the manufacturers of machinery in the Middle West and New England, and men engaged in various industries who develop small businesses from which in the old days gradually grew larger businesses to help make America strong and prosperous, in the days before the war. We have got to return to that condition. That is what normalcy means, in my judgment.

It should be a question to be considered by all of us—the Members of the Congress and the President. It should be not my program, but our program. In that way, the White House and the Congress, working together, and the happy results radiating throughout the country, we will find that labor troubles, we will find that railroad troubles, we will find that merchant marine troubles will adjust themselves just so soon as industry starts again throughout this great country of ours.

Of our merchant marine, over 600 steel ships to-day are tied at the docks and anchored in mud creeks in various parts of the coast line of the United States for want of cargoes. It is all very well for us to go around the country and talk about



the American flag on the seven seas and of our tremendous merchant marine, representing, as it does, something like \$4,000,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money, and losing to-day, as I understand, approximately \$1,000,000 a day in operation. It is a great asset to be able to talk from the public stump and wave the flag and wag the eagle's tail about the wonderful merchant marine, with the American taxpayer paying a tribute of \$1,000,000 a day for the great and glorious privilege and pleasure of having a merchant marine. I believe in the merchant marine and I believe the merchant marine can be made workable and payable, but I want it as an American asset and not simply a subject of American speeches and American pride. American pride is very necessary and very proper, but the American people are burdened with a type of taxation which they can not stand, and we can not improve the condition of affairs in the face of such a situation. With one big governmental agency, such as the merchant marine, showing the balance sheet it shows to-day, how can the situation be improved?

I said originally that we must have confidence at home and credit abroad. Statistics show that to be really prosperous this country must export 15 to 20 per cent, and some economists say more than that, of its surplus products. In other words, that 15 to 20 per cent represents the real cream, the real profit of American industry, and makes for prosperity throughout the country. That 15 to 20 per cent, in other words, means the profit. We make a profit on the other 80 per cent; of course we do, but it is the surplus that enables us to employ to the maximum. We get our best profit in the other fellow's dollar, be it the lira, the franc, or the pound.

We realize how our factories were developed because of war requirements, and so in peace times in order to enable them to employ a maximum of those who seek employment we must export from 15 to 20 per cent. We can not export that percentage to-day; we are not exporting it to-day principally because of credit conditions.

Two years ago the banner month showed exports of something over \$900,000,000, while the last month for which we have a report shows exports amounting to about \$300,000,000; in other words, the exports now are one-third of what they were two years ago, and yet the world wants our products to-day more than it ever wanted them.

I do believe that we have started in a direction whereby we can to some extent solve that problem through the incorporation of banks with power to do a foreign business—in other words, to take over foreign securities. They have not very much gold abroad to send us. With what they have sent us, we apparently have more now than we really can use, according to the reports from the Federal Reserve Board. So the only way in which we can give them credit is to take over their securities; and they have securities. They own property, just as they always did, and they have value, of course, and their securities can be taken over by our banks with power to do an international banking business, and on those securities bonds and debentures can be issued to the American public, and in that way we can practically and profitably furnish credit for our export trade.

We all know that exporters and producers are very active in endeavoring to bring this about. Only last Friday night I attended a meeting that was most illuminating in the city of Cleveland, Ohio. It was a convention of the Foreign Trade Council, and there were men present representing not big business particularly but all classes of industry in practically every State in this Union. I have in mind one man particularly with whom I happened to engage in conversation. He was a manufacturer of some kind of agricultural machinery device. He told me that he had a bona fide order representing a purchase price of about \$250,000 from Rumania, and that all that it was necessary for him to do was to find some way to bank that \$250,000 order. They were ready to give him Government bonds, they were ready to give him mortgages on their plant, they were ready to give him any securities that the ordinary banker would be glad to accept—that we would accept at any time in our domestic banking institutions. There was no method, however, through which he could bank these securities. If he had been able to do so, he could have sold his \$250,000 worth of machinery; he would have employed so many more men so much longer, and the result would have been that that would have added in great degree to the possibility of using this merchant marine and having it available to carry these cargoes to the various ports of the world.

So again, Mr. President, may I repeat that with this bill disposed of, as I hope it will be to-morrow so far as the Senate is concerned, I trust we shall recognize the absolute necessity

of getting down to the fundamentals in order to bring about a feeling of confidence here, and as far as possible to extend this credit abroad. I do not think we can look for so-called good times until we do.

The American people deserve from this Congress a clearly defined policy as to what the future relationship between government and business will be, so far as it relates to taxation—which is, of course, a very important part of it—and so far as it relates to the general regulation and supervision of the Government. The people expect much from this Congress; the people demand much from this Congress; the people are entitled to much from this Congress. They must not be disappointed.

The buying power has not in any way changed. The necessities of man have not in any way changed. Just as soon as we inspire confidence that men with will and energy and determination and some means to back it up can be permitted to do business and develop their business and employ men in order to do it, just that moment you will see automatically a great resumption of business throughout this country, which, of course, means happiness and contentment everywhere.

So, Mr. President, I have taken advantage of this time, speaking briefly on the emergency tariff bill, which is now pending, to give simply my own personal view, from some contact with business throughout the country, as to what I believe will really furnish or help to furnish at least some relief, some solution to the problems we are facing. Two years and a half ago, when we came out of the war, there was not any nation in the world, and never a nation in history, that occupied the position we occupied, with the appreciation and thanks of all our allies in the war and even the respect of our enemies, the entire world practically at our feet waiting for us to lead the way. I am not going to discuss what happened in the two years intervening. The Members of the Senate know it far better than I can possibly describe it. Differences of opinion existed, of course, but I think those were pretty well settled by the verdict of the American people last November, so that we can go on with that fresh in our minds, so far as international questions and contentions are concerned. But going back to business and industry and commerce, we have absolutely stood still, and in my judgment it is fundamentally and inherently and elementally the first responsibility of a Congress representing the activities of the people of the great country to protect and help develop the people of the Nation.

Thus, Mr. President, realizing that situation, I sincerely hope that the Senate will very promptly take up the subject of taxation in order that the American business man, farmer, cattleman, or whatever he may be, will recognize that his Government is back of him and cooperating with him and will feel that he has a chance to go ahead, and that for his energy and his ability he will receive a fair proportion of profit, and then that he will pay his Government a full proportion of taxes, but in such a way that it will not stifle, as it does to-day, whatever you may say, the energy and the enterprise which we know and must admit is lacking.

Before I sit down, in talking of the tariff in addition to taxes—and of course we are discussing the tariff to-day—I want to say very frankly, so that I shall not be misunderstood in voting for this bill, that I should be very, very unhappy indeed to see this Congress ever pass a permanent tariff bill that was not in some way elastic, or that represented a range of duties that might be considered properly an embargo on imports. Again, if I must repeat it—and I hardly think it necessary—I believe absolutely in the policy of protection; but we must view the situation to-day as it exists to-day. Just as we can not talk about the horse-drawn vehicle of 20 years ago in developing the motor and automobile trade to-day, so we can not talk about the tariff bills of 15 or 18 years ago in the consideration of a tariff bill to-day. When we are the creditor nation of the world, with a \$14,000,000,000 credit, four or five billions of which represent a difference in goods and the rest represent loans, we must recognize that that means a different situation when we compile a tariff bill, and that it means absolutely that business can not go on in one direction.

I am not making a free-trade speech, but I am making an address that counsels common sense, scientific investigation of a tariff before it is enacted into law, and that recognizes the fact that we must have certain types of imports if we are ever going to export this 15 or 20 per cent in the merchant marine that I have been discussing. You can not do business in one direction continually. It is against all the laws of supply and demand. We must protect, and protect properly, American industry and American labor, but at the same time we must balance that with a thorough realization and admission on both sides of the Chamber that we must export goods, and we must



have a market for goods on the other side as well as a market here if we are to have a full measure of prosperity in this great country.

Therefore, I simply put out this note of warning. We are not considering a tariff bill to-day; it is only an emergency bill which lasts six months, and which meets certain conditions. Very well; but for a regular policy in this country a Republican protectionist to-day must recognize that situation, and must recognize that an embargo with its possible retaliations would mean a stifling of foreign trade, and that would never be good for the industries of this country. I simply leave that note, without attempting to elucidate or go over it in great detail; but I consider it primarily important at this time when we are considering a tariff measure.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not purpose at this time to discuss the antidumping and foreign-currency valuation provisions of this bill, for the objections to these provisions have been ably and fully set forth by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I shall therefore restrict my remarks to those sections that impose duties upon certain agricultural products.

One can not study the general and sharp decline in the prices of agricultural products throughout the country without a profound feeling of sympathy for the agricultural class. But the claim that the agriculturists alone have suffered from falling prices is not well founded. Every class in the country have been victims of sudden and heavy losses in their abnormal war-profit incomes, caused by the reaction which was inevitable, following the unnatural excessive and exorbitant prices that prevailed in all goods, wares, and merchandise during the war. The manufacturer, the jobber, the retailer, the laboring class have all experienced during recent months a substantial reduction in their incomes, and all are very naturally seeking to maintain the large and unusual profits which they received as a result of the exceptional demand for American products and labor during the war. The return from the battle fields to the farms and factories of Europe, of those engaged in fighting the recent war, has of necessity revived business and agricultural production so that there can not possibly be in the immediate future any such increased demand for American-made goods and products as we have experienced during recent years. No one class of our population has a right to turn to our Government for redress under conditions which are general and affect more or less all our people, to the further detriment and injury of any other class. The laboring class can not successfully appeal for governmental aid to maintain their wages; the investment class can not expect legislation to prevent them from bearing the losses that have come to them by the decline in value of their securities; the manufacturers and business men of the community have no just right to shift upon the farmer or any other element the burden of bearing the losses which have come to them by reason of the decreased value of their goods and stocks of raw materials through falling prices. All should assume and bear the burdens of readjustment equally. It is no time for the granting of special favors to any class. The readjustment we are passing through must be worked out along natural lines, and all our people must wait patiently for world and business conditions so to shape themselves that the business of our country and of the world may return speedily to normal standards.

We are confronted with a very striking and entirely new condition as a result of this war. We have become for the first time in our history a creditor Nation instead of a debtor Nation. As such we are now to be bound by the economic and commercial laws that govern creditor nations. We can not any longer merely sell and import specie in payment for our goods. Europe is indebted to us through government and private debts to about \$15,000,000,000. This debt we all hope and expect will be met and paid in due time. It can be paid by the countries and people of Europe in one of two ways, either by sending us gold or by selling us goods and services. The countries of Europe are without gold; therefore if these debts are ever to be paid they must be paid in goods and services. For the first time, in considering tariff legislation we are confronted with the fact that we must not construct a tariff wall around our country which will prevent us from receiving the goods and services of Europe. We must bear in mind the importance of helping them to discharge their indebtedness. Herefore in shaping protective tariff legislation we have had to consider only one element, namely, that of providing such tariff rates as would serve to protect the growing industries of our country in the home markets against the importation of commodities made by the cheap labor of Europe. Our home markets are no longer the sole market for our manufacturers, jobbers, and producers. We have, whether we will it or not, so entered

into the markets of the world that our business of recent years has been developing and expanding upon the conviction that we were prepared to compete in the markets of the world and bring to America a substantial part of the export business of the world. To overlook this fact will result in leading us into a position where we may establish such tariff barriers as to confine practically our entire future business development to the now limited demand for our home markets. A tariff law which destroys or restricts our export business at the present time will be as injurious to home industries as it was claimed a few years ago the want of a protective tariff injured them.

The bill which is before us is called an emergency tariff bill. Its proponents are seeking by fixing tariff rates upon certain imports, particularly agricultural products, to keep out of the country, and out of competition with American producers, various commodities. It is the expressed theory of the proponents of this bill that by establishing high tariff rates the American producer of agricultural products will be able to obtain a higher price, and obtain from the American consumers sufficient money to offset in part the depreciation which he has experienced in prices for his products during recent months. No emergency tariff can be justified on any grounds unless it is clear that there is produced in this country a sufficient amount of the taxed product to take care of the needs of the country, and that the consumers should be charged with an increased price, so as to permit certain classes of producers to carry on their business at a profit. Clearly, if there is not produced in this country a sufficient volume of a given agricultural product to take care of the needs of this country, there is no occasion for an emergency tariff.

Mr. President, the only theory upon which a protective tariff of any kind, to say nothing at all of an emergency tariff, can be justified, is based upon a finding that a given product is being imported in such large volume as to penalize the producer of that article by making his business unprofitable and thereby destroy his business.

It seems to me certain factors should appear in order to justify an emergency tariff law: First, that the cost of the article produced in America has been driven to a price lower than the cost of production because of the unusual and excess of foreign importation of that article. Second, that the production of the given article in America is sufficient to meet the wants of the country. Neither of these factors can be established from an impartial analysis of the pending bill, and therefore a tariff can not be justified after such an examination of the specific items in this bill. In practically every instance it can be shown that there is either an overproduction and a large exportation from this country of the agricultural products named in this bill or the production is so limited and small that for the general prosperity and welfare of our people it is essential and necessary to permit importation without duty of these agricultural products.

An examination of statistics and well-known information in regard to some of these articles will prove, I believe, beyond question that this emergency tariff bill as framed will not meet the emergency claimed for it and will result in very serious losses to the American people as a whole and impair and injure materially the growing and expanding export business of the country.

I might add that most of the information which I now place before the Senate has come from various publications of the United States Tariff Commission, namely:

Agricultural Staples and the Tariff.  
Wheat and Flour Trade (published as a letter to the Senate Finance Committee).  
Animal and Vegetable Oils and Fats.  
Survey of the Coconut Products Industry.  
Survey of the Dairy Products Industry.  
Survey of the American Raw Cotton Industry.  
Survey of the American Bean Industry.  
Survey of the Peanut Industry.  
The Wool Growing Industry (as given in a letter to the Committee on Finance, United States Senate).  
The Apple Industry.  
The summary of tariff information prepared for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, under the direction of the clerk of the committee, by the Tariff Commission.

I think I can justly claim that the information is bipartisan and nonpartisan. Let us proceed to examine some of the items in this schedule of agricultural products that are to be protected by an emergency tariff.

#### FLAXSEED.

Flaxseed is used solely as a source of linseed oil, which is extensively consumed in paints, varnishes, and in linoleums and oilcloths.

Our production of flaxseed is wholly inadequate to our requirements; in fact, there has been a world shortage of this product. Substitute and adulterant oils have been imported



in large and rapidly increasing quantities. Such substitutes are perilla, soya bean, tung, and china-wood oil.

The United States imports 60 per cent of its flaxseed, chiefly from the Argentine, and also from Canada. American requirements are about 30,000,000 bushels, and we import about 20,000,000 and produce about 10,000,000.

The import duty on flaxseed under the Underwood law is now 20 cents. It is proposed under the emergency tariff law to raise this to 30 cents. So we are confronted at the very outset with the proposition of making a substantial increase in the import tax upon this commodity, 60 per cent of which is imperative and necessary for our demands.

This is a tax upon the whole building industry. Even the farmers themselves will be the greatest sufferers by such an import duty to the extent that they are among the chief users of paints and varnishes. Only in a few States—that is, the Dakotas and Montana—can any benefit possibly accrue, and even in these States it will be offset by higher prices for paints and varnishes.

An increase of 10 cents will of necessity raise the price of the whole 30,000,000 bushels and will add at least \$3,000,000 to the cost of paints and varnishes. In actual operation it would probably amount to more than \$3,000,000, because such a tax tends greatly to increase through higher interest and handling charges.

This is one phase of the situation; there is still another and more serious phase: The proponents of this measure have failed to make a proper readjustment of the duty upon linseed oil, which remains at the rate fixed in the Underwood law, the present law.

In view of the fact that most of our supply comes from abroad, the lack of adjustment between the duty upon oil and flaxseed will result in shutting down the great linseed-oil industry, which is located chiefly around the Great Lakes and in New York State. So this tax on flaxseed will greatly hinder if not shut down our linseed-oil industry and also limit the price which the farmer will get for his flaxseed, because the manufacturer of linseed oil will not be able to compete with imported linseed oil, on which there has been no increase in the tariff.

Mr. President, another element to consider in the imposition of this additional tariff tax on flaxseed is the effect it will have upon the sale of a very important by-product, namely, linseed-oil cake. Thirty-six pounds out of every 56-pound bushel of flaxseed goes out in the form of linseed-oil cake after the oil is extracted. This linseed-oil cake is exported in large quantities to Europe. It is a very important factor in the linseed-oil business. The effect of this increased tariff tax on flaxseed will result in an increase in the price of this linseed-oil cake, making the exportation price prohibitive. Consequently, it will probably paralyze temporarily if not ruin the linseed-oil industry.

Is it any wonder that the linseed oil manufacturers around the Great Lakes are protesting vigorously against the flaxseed provision of the pending emergency tariff bill? The situation which I have described in regard to flaxseed applies to almost every article named in this bill.

#### OTHER VEGETABLE OILS.

High, if not prohibitive, tariffs are proposed for cottonseed oil, coconut oil, and soya-bean oil. These oils are now free of duty. Cottonseed oil is made from cotton seed; coconut oil is made from copra, the dried meat of coconuts; and soya-bean oil is made from soya beans. All of these oils are more or less competitive, price being the determining factor as to the extent to which they are used. Their chief uses are in the manufacture of oleomargarine or butter substitutes (which compete with dairy products through the substitution of oleomargarine for butter) and in the manufacture of lard substitutes (which compete with the hog industry through the competition of lard substitutes with lard), and in the soap industry, where they compete with tallow and similar products.

In view of the fact that the framers of this bill have omitted to place a duty upon the raw materials of these oils—that is, upon copra, cotton seed, and soya beans, which now are free of duty—the proposed tariff can have no substantial operation. Furthermore, approximately 75 per cent of our coconut oil comes from the Philippines, with which we have free trade and which will not be affected by the proposed legislation. The Philippines, according to official statistics, have about 60,000,000 coconut palms, of which only 30,000,000 are in bearing. It is obvious, therefore, that the importation of coconut oil from the Philippines may be greatly increased; and, in view of the fact that all these oils are capable of substitution one for another, this free trade with the Philippines will nullify whatever effect the proposed duty might have.

Instead of protecting the domestic cotton-seed industry, domestic butter and hog industries, the only effect of this bill will be to greatly increase the profits of the domestic crushers of imported materials. These crushers, it is safe to say, it was not the purpose of this bill to protect.

#### WHEAT AND FLOUR.

At the present time the importing countries of the world depend upon the United States and Canada for fully 80 per cent of their imported wheat and flour. It is apparent, therefore, that so long as the international price level dominates the American markets a tariff can be of little practical significance. In point of fact a tariff upon wheat has only very uncertain advantages and many clear disadvantages. This aspect of the situation has been set forth by the United States Tariff Commission in one of its publications, in which it enumerates the things that can be said to the advantage of the tariff on wheat and the things that can be said to its disadvantage. I refer to the document known as Supplemental Information Concerning the Wheat and Flour Trade, particularly the discussion of this subject on pages 7 and 8.

West of the Rockies the wheat trade is quite distinct from that flowing eastward. The western wheat flows to Seattle and Portland, either for export or to meet the deficiencies of California. To this wheat, therefore, the tariff is of no significance, because the Canadian wheat does not enter into these markets, and it is entirely on an export basis. The tariff has been supposed to affect primarily the hard and spring wheat producing regions of the Northwest, the Dakotas and Minnesota, which produce the type of wheat that Canada exports almost entirely—the hard spring wheat. But a large and increasing proportion of the crop of those States consists of durum wheat. This wheat is used chiefly in the manufacture of macaroni, spaghetti, and similar edible pastes. Canada produces little or no durum wheat. Over half of this supply, upon an average, is exported, chiefly to the Mediterranean countries, so of the production of the Dakotas and Minnesota a very large part therefore may be exempted so far as Canadian competition is concerned.

East of the Mississippi the crop consists almost entirely of soft wheats, and this type constitutes a very considerable part of the crop of the States south of this hard spring wheat section. To a considerable extent the price level of soft wheat is independent of that for hard wheat. Soft wheats are used chiefly in the manufacture of biscuits, cakes, and similar pastries. It is true, to a limited extent, soft wheat so competes with the hard wheats, but it is fair to say that in a general way the markets are independent, so the greater part of the producing area may be in a sense exempted from the operation of the tariff.

What effect, therefore, has the tariff upon the hard spring wheat producing sections? It is in these sections that the milling industry has made most rapid progress. In the face of their increasing capacity the acreage in spring wheats has remained stationary. They have outgrown their domestic sources of supply of hard spring wheat. Their alternative, therefore, is either to take more of the southern hard winter wheats or to bring in Canadian wheat. In view of the fact that the southern wheat is upon an exporting basis indirectly, therefore, it influences the hard spring wheats, and they can not with profit go against the natural flow of wheat southward and eastward by bringing such wheat to the northern mills.

The situation is more clearly outlined by an examination of the trade during the current crop year. The American crop amounted to approximately 790,000,000 bushels and there was a carry-over from the preceding crop of approximately 151,000,000 bushels. Deducting a domestic consumption for food and seed of 630,000,000 bushels and an average carry-over of approximately 80,000,000 bushels (for it is not possible to scrape the bins before the arrival of the new crop), there remains an exportable surplus of 230,000,000 bushels. But during the nine months ending March 31, 1921, there has already been shipped out 277,000,000 bushels, and exports are still continuing. Imports of Canadian wheat and flour amount to 49,000,000 bushels. It is clear, therefore, that Canadian wheat has been absorbed in the American markets. It has been reexported, chiefly in the form of flour, or it has been released for export equivalent quantities of wheat from other sections. In addition, a considerable movement of wheat has been moved from Canada in bond through our ports. By reason of her transportation situation much of the Canadian flour must move through American ports. This is an asset which should not be cast aside.

After the wheat crop is harvested Canada has only about 70 days to export through Canadian ports before the close of navigation. The facilities at Halifax and St. John are totally inadequate for winter movements; the hazards of shipping on



account of perils due to ice and the higher marine rates discourage shipments from those ports. Her alternative, therefore, is either to ship this wheat immediately or store it, incur storage and interest charges, and face the possibilities of the international price situation incident to later competition from the crops of Argentina and Australia, which are harvested in December and January, and the crop of British India, which is harvested in March and April.

Wheat is the chief asset of the Canadian farmer, and the mere carrying of this tremendous crop involves tremendous outlay. By shipping it to American ports, to the great primary markets of the South, this wheat is more easily absorbed. If the Canadian wheat were permitted to fall on the world's markets in November and October in volume exceeding the storage and absorbing capacities of Europe it would depress price levels, which in turn react on American prices. If they were permitted entry into the southern markets they would serve as a buffer and maintain our own prices upon more even scale. That this situation is generally recognized is indicated by the Russian Government's action in 1913, when she took measures to keep the Russian crop off the market until the Canadian flow had passed.

It might be well to note that the flour-milling industry is the third largest industry in the United States. Canadian wheat and flour has been rapidly displacing American wheat and flour in England, the great importing market of the world. While American millers have had access to high-grade Canadian hard spring wheat, they have met this competition and have been shipping in large quantities American flour, milled in America, to England.

The imposition of a tariff, which all agree is going to shut out Canadian wheat, will gradually diminish the exportation of flour to England.

It follows that if the export market for flour declines the demand for our farmers' wheat on the part of American millers must of necessity decline and harmfully affect the price the producer is able to obtain.

Canada has shipped as much as \$425,000,000 worth of wheat to foreign markets. The fact that the Canadian dollar is at a discount of approximately 15 per cent has tended to limit American shipments to Canada, at the same time as it has stimulated shipments from competing European sections, where Canadian money is at a premium. If the wheat were permitted to flow through our markets our opportunities for shipping other products would be greatly increased. Our exports to Canada are far in excess of imports, and this is true even of foodstuffs. We import raw materials from Canada and ship to her prepared foodstuffs. Such a trade should not be discouraged.

In view of these indisputable facts, how can the proponents of this measure successfully contend that the tariff rate upon wheat named in this bill will result in giving the producer in America a higher price for his wheat than he is now obtaining? Of course, there is no other claim made by the advocates of this bill. Especially there can be none in a tariff measure that is called an emergency measure. This bill must do either one of two things—it must reduce the price of wheat or it must result in giving the producer an advance in price over what he is now receiving; and if it is the latter, it means that every consumer in America must pay that advanced price.

Of course, if the producer does succeed in getting a higher price, this bill ought to be called "A bill to increase the cost of living to the American public," because most of the commodities dealt with in this bill are agricultural products, which are the basic necessities of life. If it does not result in an increased price to the producer, it clearly does result in serious and widespread disadvantages to the American people through (1) the lessening of the export of all manufactured and food products to Canada; (2) reduction in the volume of railroad transportation business from Canada to American ports, and a consequent reduction in the ocean traffic from American ports at the very time when we are seeking to build up a merchant marine; (3) the loss of mill feed, a valuable by-product of flour, which is greatly in demand by producers of milk and dairy products; (4) a loss by our distributing, elevating, and storage interests which would handle this great flood of Canadian wheat; and (5) an indirect loss to the American farmer through the effect of the Canadian flood upon international price levels, which would in turn react upon our domestic prices.

Still another factor requires consideration. The proposed tariff is so poorly framed as to leave loopholes for evading proposed duties; for instance, note the tax of 35 cents per bushel on wheat and 20 per cent ad valorem upon flour. It is a very unscientific provision, since the flour prices vary directly with the price of wheat. The combination of specific duty with

the fluctuating duty upon the basis of ad valorem throws the markets entirely out of alignment.

If, for instance, wheat sells at \$2, a tariff of 35 cents a bushel is, roughly, about 16 per cent, but the tariff on flour is 20 per cent, or with wheat at \$1 the tariff of 35 cents a bushel is, roughly, 33 per cent, whereas the tariff on flour remains only 20 per cent.

Furthermore, the customs lawyers will wax fat in litigation over other phases of this rate. The present tariff (Underwood law) reads as follows:

Free list: Wheat, wheat flour, semolina, and wheat products, provided that there shall be levied a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and 45 cents a barrel upon wheat flour and semolina and 10 per cent upon other wheat products, when from a country which imposes a duty on wheat, wheat flour, and semolina.

Now, if wheat be only slightly milled, it would be neither wheat, wheat flour, nor semolina, which is the product of durum wheat. If from Argentina, for instance, which has no duty on American wheat, partially milled wheat would be free of duty, and such wheat can be remilled into flour. A wheat product such as crushed or cracked wheat, for instance, would come in from Canada at 10 per cent. For illustration, if Canada should alter her present tariff law on wheat and flour, which is similar to our own, her shippers could avoid this whole emergency tariff by shipping into this country free of duty a product of wheat such as crushed or cracked wheat.

#### CATTLE.

Cattle, which are now under the free list, are dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem under the proposed bill. Quarantine requirements limit shipment of live cattle to Canada and Mexico. At least half or more of the imports consist of feeder cattle, cattle which are shipped to the corn belt and to the Eastern States for fattening. Such imports are an asset rather than a liability. With the increase in homesteading on the western ranges the supply of cheap feeder cattle has been gradually diminished, and the imported stock enables us to utilize to greater advantage our increasing corn crop. The farmers themselves would be harmed by the tariff upon feeder cattle. Yet this proposed tax makes no distinction between feeder cattle and fat cattle. Of course, the proponents of this measure intended to provide an increased revenue for the producers of fat cattle by this bill, but apparently did not have in mind the effect of this legislation upon feeder cattle.

Section 15 provides that cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes shall be admitted free of duty. The present tariff reads that only pure-bred registered stock shall be admitted free of duty, it being considered to the interest of the agricultural sections to permit the free entry of high-grade breeding stock. This hastily framed legislation merely reads "imported for breeding purposes." It would be extremely difficult to determine whether scrub cows or bulls imported into this country were for breeding purposes or for slaughter or for fattening, and in consequence the purpose of this provision would be extremely difficult to put into effect.

In other words, the provisions of this section can be circumvented by anybody setting up the claim that they were importing cattle for breeding purposes and bringing large numbers into the country, which they may temporarily put to grazing, and after a short period sell for slaughter. To make null and void this provision, which has been framed to advance the price of cattle to the cattle producers of the country, all that is necessary is to make a claim at port of entry that the cattle are for breeding purposes. How can a protective tariff, one so filled with inconsistencies and errors, be of any possible assistance to the farmers?

#### FRESH MEATS.

It should be noted, also, that the duties upon fresh beef, veal, mutton, and lamb are out of proportion to the duty on the live stock; that is, at the rates provided, it is more advantageous to bring in the product rather than the live animal. This means our slaughter and packing house industries will lose just that much business. The American packers control over 60 per cent of the exports of Argentina and Uruguay, sources from which a large part of the imported meats come. It hardly seems probable that American packers will bring in meats to compete with their own domestic product. In any event this tariff provision will tend to encourage them to bring in fresh meats rather than live cattle.

A steer averaging 1,000 pounds, at a market valuation of, say, \$100, would under this bill pay a duty of \$30. Assuming a dressed weight of 50 per cent, 500 pounds of beef from that steer would pay a duty of only \$10, as against \$30 for the live animal. A somewhat similar condition obtains with respect to duties on sheep, lamb, and mutton.



## COTTON.

Cotton is now on the free list. The proposed duty upon cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length is 7 cents per pound. This provision, therefore, only deals with Egyptian cotton, which is produced in the Southwest. The United States produces nearly twice as much cotton as all the rest of the world combined, but over 88 per cent of this production consists of short staple. Long-staple cottons are essential for two purposes—the production of fine counts and the production of yarns of any kind where strength and superior wearing qualities are necessary. Egypt is virtually the only large source of long-staple cottons measuring 1½ inches in length. Only a small proportion of our supply is produced in the United States, and it is improbable that any considerable proportion will be domestically raised in the near future. In recent years the sudden growth of the tire fabric industries has rendered the world shortage of long-staple cotton more acute. It appears, therefore, that a duty upon this cotton is sufficiently undesirable from any view, and especially indefensible from the viewpoint of emergency legislation. The result of this tax is certain to work injury to our automobile tire trade, to our textile industries, and especially to the textile industries which are most directly affected by foreign competition, in increasing the price of one of their chief raw materials.

Section 17 provides an offset duty of 7 cents per pound over the existing rates, to offset this duty upon raw material. In operation it appears almost impossible to carry this provision into effect. In manufacture there is considerable loss for which no provision is made, and furthermore it would be almost impossible to determine in any yarn the length of cotton which has been used in its manufacture.

## WOOL.

Wool is now on the free list. It is proposed to place a duty of 15 cents per pound upon unwashed wool, 30 cents on washed wool, and 45 cents on scoured wool. It is further provided that wool which has been sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of its original fleece shall carry a duty of 45 cents per pound.

In view of the fact that the wool of South America and Australia is so advanced by the process known as skirting the actual duty is 45 cents per pound. In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee it was brought out that there was nearly a 2-year supply of wool on hand. In view of this fact, what may be said for an emergency tariff upon wool?

If the markets of central Europe were to resume consumption of wool upon a prewar basis, it is doubtful if there would be a large, if any, world shortage of wool.

In view of this enormous available supply of wool it is very doubtful whether the tariff will increase the price of the farmers' wool to any considerable extent. But it is apparent that the increase of 45 cents per pound allowed to textile manufacturers, as compensatory duty, is an additional duty upon the consumers of textile fabrics in this country.

An objection similar to the case of cotton appears in the compensatory duty of 45 cents a pound upon wool in the form of manufactured products. There is a considerable reduction in weight in the manufacturing process and it would be extremely difficult to determine accurately the compensatory duty on the textiles.

## RICE.

The duty on rice has been doubled. The United States exports about ten times as much rice as it imports for consumption. So great has been the overproduction of rice, that no matter what the tariff a reduction in the domestic acreage is certain during the present year. The trade is largely in the hands of two growers' organizations—the Southern Rice Growers' Association and the Pacific Rice Growers' Association, which attempt to fix minimum prices and, it has been said, have sold American rice to foreign trade at lower prices than obtained in our home markets. No emergency can be claimed for rice. Within the last 20 years our rice production has quadrupled, part of it during the period of the Underwood tariff. This increase has been primarily due to the development since 1913 of rice cultivation in the Sacramento Valley. A large part of the California crop is produced by orientals. The chief benefit of the tariff would accrue to the land speculators who have profited largely by the rice development in California. A large part of the crop of that State is raised by renters. Whatever justification there may be for a tariff, under no circumstances should it be used to promote land speculation or to enrich oriental labor in America; and the proposed tariff, if it will have any effect at all on rice, is bound to benefit chiefly these two classes.

## LEMONS.

The tariff on lemons has been quadrupled, from one-half cent to 2 cents per pound. The present price of lemons in New York City is around \$2 per box, a net weight of about 75 pounds to the box. Before any Sicilian lemons may be imported we must pay therefor approximately \$1.50 for tariff, about 50 cents for packing and other material and an additional 50 cents for ocean freight, making a total of \$2.50 in New York without a cent to the foreign producer. Such a protection therefore is overwhelming—a protection of 100 per cent at prevailing market prices.

Lemons are a household necessity. In this case it might be well to add that this tax will amount to a protection of 100 per cent to one organization which controls about 75 per cent of the American production. One hundred and ten million American people are to be taxed 100 per cent chiefly for the benefit of this one organization.

Upon Sicily virtually all of Europe is dependent for its supply of lemons and the Sicilian production has reached its maximum. It takes nearly a generation to develop a lemon-growing industry. So that without tariff the consumption of lemons in America and the world and the decreasing importation of Sicilian lemons would result in giving a progressively increasing market to the producers of America. At the present time the California crop, by reason of the increased freight rates, has virtually a monopoly of the markets west of the Mississippi and western Canada.

## OLIVE OIL.

The duty on olive oil has been doubled, from 20 cents to 40 cents per gallon. Our production is only about 5 per cent of our olive oil requirements, 95 per cent coming from abroad, chiefly from Spain and Italy. There is a world shortage of olive oil, a shortage so great that in the countries of origin—where olive oil is extensively used as butter—export taxes and export embargoes have been in force. In view of the fact that 95 per cent of our supply comes from abroad and that it would take fully a generation to develop our industry, if it ever can be developed, to the point of meeting our requirements, no emergency may be claimed. Here again is a proposed tax on 110,000,000 of our people when 95 per cent of our supply is imported for the benefit of a few people in America engaged in the production of olive oil.

## SUGAR.

The United States produces approximately one-half of its sugar requirements. It is dependent upon Cuba for the remainder of its supply. In view of this condition no emergency may be claimed for the sugar provision of the proposed act. Furthermore, Cuba has become, under the preferential tariffs granted her, an important and rapidly increasing market for American goods. This tariff, therefore, is subject to question on many grounds which have been fully argued by other Senators opposing this bill.

## DAIRY PRODUCTS.

Increases are provided for butter, oleomargarine, cheese, milk, and cream, but in 1920 our exports of dairy products were over five times as large as our imports. The exports amounted to \$126,742,429, while the imports amounted to \$21,842,886.

A very large part of the imports consisted of cheese of the types not produced to any large extent in this country. It is clear that here again it would be absurd to claim an emergency.

It is true that a considerable quantity of Danish butter has arrived in eastern markets, but this butter is of a very high grade and of a quality not produced in sufficient quantity in the United States. It sells for a slightly higher price than much of the American product.

Milk and cream, now free of duty, are assessed at 2 cents a gallon for milk and 5 cents a gallon for cream. This trade is largely a border proposition. The imports go chiefly to the congested eastern centers. With the relatively limited shipping radius of fresh milk, it seems unfair further to tax the city dwellers of the East.

The taxing of these dairy products will simply result in higher prices to the consumers in the Eastern States and will be of no benefit to western farmers because the railroad haul is too long for shipments of fresh milk and cream.

Preserved and condensed milk, now free of duty, are assessed at 2 cents per pound. In 1920 our exports of such milk amounted to \$204,000,000. Our imports to only \$2,500,000. It is absurd to maintain that an emergency situation exists in a trade of this character.

I might add, the same hasty and faulty handling of the drafting of the tariff schedule is apparent in the milk schedule.



No provision has been made for preserved or condensed cream. In consequence such cream will enter free of duty, while the fresh cream will be taxed at 5 cents per gallon. It will merely mean that more cream will be imported in preserved form.

## TOBACCO.

The tariff on unstemmed wrapper tobacco is increased from \$1.85 to \$2.35 per pound and on stemmed wrapper tobacco from \$2.50 to \$3.

Relatively, only a limited region produces wrapper tobacco and the present protection amounts to over 150 per cent on an ad valorem basis. It is proposed to increase this further. No compensatory adjustment has been made for a duty upon cigars. What the effect of this faulty framing of the bill will be remains to be seen.

## APPLES.

The apples duty affects chiefly the trade between Canada and the United States. The United States ships more apples to Canada than it receives from that country, and our exports of apples far outweigh the imports. No emergency can be claimed here. Our exports of apples in the year 1920 amounted to \$3,155,094; our imports to only \$748,566.

## CORN.

Corn is now free of duty; a tariff of 15 cents per bushel is proposed. The United States produces more than twice as much corn as the rest of the world combined. Our crop amounts to around 3,000,000,000 bushels. Imports have never exceeded 15,000,000, while our average exports are at least double that amount. The indirect exports in the form of lard, tallow, beef products, and the products of animals to which corn is fed are far in excess of that amount.

The great bulk of the imported corn is used by the manufacturers of corn products near New York City. They export a large part of the products made from imported corn to Europe in the form of corn meal and cornstarch. It is apparent, therefore, that with an export trade of these dimensions and with the character of utilization of the imported corn that the duty is only a nominal one. Certainly no emergency can be claimed in the case of our corn production. In view of the overwhelming predominance of the United States in the production and exportation of corn, does it seem conceivable that a customhouse duty on this product would have an effect upon domestic prices?

Here again is manifested the hasty and faulty technical framing of the law. The status of corn products has not been affected. Corn meal, for instance, remains free of duty, and for some of the uses of the imported corn partially milled Argentine corn may serve.

## BEANS.

The foreign competition in beans comes chiefly from Japan and Korea, but even during the period when the largest imports have been arriving larger exports were being shipped to European markets. Since the decline in the prices of beans virtually no imports for consumption have been entering domestic markets. No emergency may be claimed in the case of this commodity, just as it can not be claimed in the case of corn, wheat, flaxseed, the oils, and other products named in this bill.

## POTATOES.

Rigid quarantine regulations virtually prohibit a substantial import of potatoes except from Canada. There is a considerable flow of domestic potatoes to Canada, and a larger flow of Canadian potatoes to our eastern markets. The supply of potatoes in the eastern markets is contributed chiefly by Maine and western New York, but these regions do not produce sufficient for the North Atlantic requirements.

The price of potatoes fluctuates tremendously from year to year, almost from month to month, according to climatic and harvest conditions. Prices at times rise to such levels as to cause distress in the congested urban centers of the manufacturing regions of the East. At other times, when there is an abundance of potatoes, prices fall below the cost of production. Under such conditions it would seem that a free movement north and south of the Canadian border is desirable. If a large crop is produced in the United States, then prices will not permit of large exportations, while if prices are high, due to a shortage, then it is to the public interest to admit imports from whatever sources they are available.

The chief demand for a duty on potatoes has come from one county in northern Maine. That county can not produce more than a small proportion of the potato requirement of our Eastern States, and to that county it is really of very little moment whether the additional supply be brought in from Canada or from the West. It is merely a readjustment of the source of the supply rather than a protection.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me warn the majority party of the injury this legislation will do to a section of the United States that does not deserve from the Republican Party a request that amounts to an embargo on its future. It must be borne in mind that the Northeastern States, so far as the demand for food supplies is concerned, is the England of America. New England and the North Atlantic States must obtain food supplies from sections beyond the Canadian border line and the Allegheny Mountains. Any attempt to shut off the natural flow of food supplies from Canada is certain to result in serious detriment to the industrial progress and development of that section of the United States, because the increased cost of food supplies by reason of the long hauls will mean an increase in the cost of living that will prevent the steady progress and advancement of these States. Moreover, the increased cost of living will eventually react on the price of products of this section of the country, and the effect of the tariff would be to raise the level of prices without benefit to the farmer or consumer.

But I also urge you to reject this measure to prevent injury to the farmer whose welfare you are attempting—mistakenly, I believe—to promote. Of the general provisions of the act it may be said, first, that this duty has to be enforced during a period of six months; that is during part of the season when the American crops are moving to the markets. In view of the fact that these are temporary raises, and in view of the probable fact that the permanent raise may not be fixed at the same high level, instead of being a tariff favoring the producer, it will greatly hinder him through impeding a normal movement to the markets and have a tendency to restrict and limit greatly the purchase of these products by shippers and jobbers. Instead of aiding the farmer it will greatly injure him, for the reason that the wholesalers and dealers will be disinclined to pay the high prices which it is the purpose of this act to establish. The uncertainty of trade in piling up agriculture products with this temporary provision is apt to create still more harm.

Mr. President, it is evident from the foregoing analysis of different articles mentioned in this bill that tariffs upon agricultural commodities, except in a limited number of instances, may not have at all the effect of raising the general level of prices to the producer that the advocates of this measure claim. But to whatever extent it will raise the prices to the producer it will react in higher cost of living and in a higher cost for the things the farmer must buy. During the war, for instance, high prices for agricultural products were closely followed by an increase in prices for the things the farmer purchased, and the result was little net advantage to him. The chief result of a higher level of prices of agricultural products and the consequent increase in the level of all prices would be greatly to impair our export trade.

From every standpoint this bill is most objectionable. It will injure, not help. It is the beginning of the abandonment of our export trade. It is a serious blow to our manufacturing industries. It is an indefensible precedent.

Mr. President, the majority party of this body will make a very serious mistake if it enacts this measure into law. It will tend to shake the confidence if indeed it does not drive away from its support elements of citizenship of our country who have been the very backbone of the Republican Party in the last generation.

The view of the American people toward tariff legislation has changed, and changed materially. The change that has been wrought as a result of the war has made our people begin to appreciate that we now must keep in mind the necessity of cultivating an export business and that we must do an export business to keep our present industries active. Heretofore the only problem was the protection of home industries, the building up of home industries to supply the home markets. But we are beyond that stage. We are in the world markets, and when you come to deal with the tariff upon the old basis, of simply protecting the home markets, you are beginning to abandon the export business that has been so rapidly expanding during recent years.

I can not conceive of any substantial reason why the Republican majority in this Chamber would dare go before the country and seriously contend that this measure was not either class legislation or an attempt to extort dollars from a substantial majority of the American people to make up the discrepancies and losses of another group of our people. These are days of reconstruction. A terrible World War has shaken humanity as nothing else has in our day. Do you think business is going to escape without a scar, that human beings alone are to be bruised and bled? Every class has lost and every class is suffering. Of course the farmer has met with losses, and I



sympathize with him and with our laboring people, our manufacturers, and the holders of investment securities. They have all met with heavy financial reverses. They are all suffering as a result of what has followed since the war. But human beings everywhere are also broken in spirit, their hopes dashed, and the future made gloomy and dark.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNUM in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. And the leadership on the other side, headed by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], have stated that no amendments to this bill will be allowed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have heard that statement, but do not know of its correctness. It is very evident that it is the intention of the majority to pass this bill and make claim to the farmers of the country that they are now and in the future to enjoy the benefits of a protective tariff. But there can not be a protective tariff applied successfully to agricultural products, especially where those products are being exported in large volume, or in a country where the production of agricultural products is so small that to shut out such products will result in penalizing and punishing the great majority of the nonagriculturists.

This is a basic industry. If agriculture must be protected, then everything must be protected. The only theory of a protective tariff, as I have understood it, has been the necessity of stimulating home industries—small, growing industries, which were needed in America to produce the things for which we have been dependent upon Europe. That period has largely passed. Home markets alone will not keep our American business active and thriving to-day. We must keep in mind the necessity of doing a foreign export business, and this bill means the restriction, if not the end, of much of our export business. These tariffs upon agricultural products mean that we propose to build a wall around this country and shut out imports of raw materials, and that means that the other countries of the world will be forced to build walls around themselves to keep out our manufactured products.

Mr. President, these are my views upon this measure, and I want to repeat that I think this bill is a very serious mistake. I believe the country is bound to suffer, and I think the Republican Party, just now coming into power in the full flush of victory, is attempting to enact legislation which is indefensible. I do not know of a Republican journal in the eastern part of the country which has attempted to make a serious defense of this legislation. It is the beginning of the death knell. If such legislation is continued the Republican Party can not go before the consuming public of America and expect a favorable verdict. The American people will not support such one-sided class legislation.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

#### PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN COUNCILS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask leave to submit a resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and to lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to have the resolution read, if there is no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked to have the resolution printed in the RECORD. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] is seeking recognition to make a speech on the unfinished business, and as the Senator from Wisconsin has asked that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, I think that is sufficient.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent to have it read. It is very short.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well, if the Senator insists that it shall be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the resolution will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 74) as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has accepted the invitation extended through the British ambassador to designate representatives to attend upon the sessions and participate in the deliberations of the supreme council and the reparations commission created to carry into effect and enforce the terms of the treaty of Versailles; and Whereas the treaty of Versailles is a crime born of blind revenge and insatiable greed and constitutes a betrayal of the solemn promises of this Government made to the world and formally accepted by the Allies as the basis of the peace terms; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles or to give its sanction either to the League of Nations or to the unjust conditions of that treaty; and

Whereas the people of the United States by an overwhelming majority in a great and solemn referendum indorsed the action of the Senate in rejecting the said treaty; and

Whereas the Senate has by an overwhelming majority adopted a resolution declaring the war with Germany at an end; and

Whereas our participation in the deliberations of the supreme council may be accepted as an indorsement by the Government of the United States of the imperialistic policies which the members of the supreme council are now pursuing in Europe, Africa, and Asia and as a sanction of the barbarous and uncivilized warfare which is now being waged against the people of Ireland in contravention of the laws of war as prescribed by The Hague convention and in violation of the pledges solemnly made during the war that the rights of small nations should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that it is contrary to American ideals and traditions for the Government of the United States to participate in any manner in councils the purposes of which constitute a denial of freedom and self-government and thus sanction, or appear to sanction, the acts of oppression which are now being inflicted upon Ireland, India, and other subject nations, and that it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should not take part in any foreign councils except upon the express understanding that the purposes of such councils are to be the fulfillment of the pledges made by the responsible representatives of this country and the allied Governments during the war, foremost amongst which was the establishment throughout the world of government by consent of the governed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I shall have to object if there is to be any discussion of the resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not going to discuss the resolution. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to something in this connection. I understood that the order had been made.

Mr. CURTIS. It has not been made, for if there is to be discussion, it is in the nature of an objection, when the regular order is demanded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is objection, the resolution goes to the table for printing.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Unanimous consent has been asked that it be printed and lie on the table. To that I have no objection, but I do object to any discussion of the resolution, and I shall demand the regular order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The order was made before it was read that it should be received and lie on the table. The reading was called for afterwards. I did not ask to have the resolution read.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I asked in my own right that it be read. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not going to discuss the resolution, but in connection with it I wish to state that there appeared in a morning paper a statement by one William Allen White, a very distinguished Republican, one who I understand was a member of the platform committee at the Chicago convention last year. It is true that he followed one wing of that party some years ago and was then styled a Bull Moose, but he has since come back into the fold and is now reckoned as being very close to the present administration, and no doubt his expressions carry great weight throughout the country. Any utterance touching the policies of the present administration respecting foreign affairs and domestic policies would have great weight in the country and would be looked upon as coming from headquarters; but when it appears in one of the papers in the city of Washington that is dominated and controlled by one of the high Republican leaders of to-day, a member of the President's Cabinet, Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, of course it carries more significance, and particularly when accompanying the statement of William Allen White there appears in Mr. Hoover's paper an editorial, as appeared this morning, entitled "President Wilson's Clothes," it carries still greater weight and more significance. I shall read just a few extracts:

The Democrats in Congress—

Says the editorial in the Herald—

are being mighty decent. They are entitled to commendation for not trying merely to get in the way, to "ball things up," and to delay action.

That is a very splendid comment and very just. The editorial further says:

There is no reason to believe opposition to the complete foreign relations program will meet serious opposition from the larger body of Democratic Senators. It is more apt to come from a few dissenting Republicans.

That is why I read it at this particular time, following the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].



No one of them should object to the solace they get from saying that the Republicans have put on President Wilson's clothes. This has fully as much of truth as the claim of the Republican extreme irreconcilables that the vote of November 2 was a verdict against any slightest Wilsonian taint; that everything ever advocated by Mr. Wilson is unclean, and that no remnant of his program can be accepted; that the people then declared that nothing which by any stretch of the imagination could be credited to Mr. Wilson shall be even considered. \* \* \*

\* \* \* But in principle it was upheld by a majority of the last Senate.

That is, Mr. Wilson's foreign policy as a whole.

If Mr. Wilson had been content to get only the principle and had forgotten the details, the treaty would have been ratified with votes to spare.

The editorial further says:

It happens, also, that President Harding was one who voted for ratifying the treaty with reservations.

To accept no part of the principle claimed for Mr. Wilson would mean the complete isolation of the United States and a separate treaty of peace with Germany. This is as far from the real sentiment of the Republican Party as would be the adoption of the treaty of Versailles without change. When President Harding made Mr. Hughes his Secretary of State—no appointment he has made was and is more popular—he gave conclusive notice that he had not so radically changed his position as to be classed with either extreme. Somewhere there is a middle ground, and if the Democrats take comfort from the fact that the administration seems to be seeking it—well, it will take at least 10 Democratic votes in the Senate and maybe more to finally adopt any form of a foreign policy.

This is a very remarkable editorial, and appearing in the same issue of the paper that contained the interview with William Allen White, a member of the last Republican platform committee and, I believe, one of the advisers of the present administration, I ask that the William Allen White article be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

[From the Washington Herald, Tuesday, May 10, 1921.]

HARDING KIND TO LEAGUE FOES, BUT PRESSES HIS OWN POLICY—  
WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE SAYS PRESIDENT'S COURSE WILL DISLODGE  
IRRECONCILABLES AND LAND AMERICA IN ASSOCIATION.

(By William Allen White.)

President Harding is having a sad time hushing the irreconcilables. Every day they are quieter than they were.

To-day they are stirring in their stupor because the joint resolution for a separate peace with Germany does not move out of the House of Representatives. They feel that the President is keeping the resolution there for his own purposes. And they fear that the President's purpose in delaying the peace resolution would be only to give him time to work out the plans of Hughes and others.

HOLD UP TARIFF MEASURE.

The plan of Hughes is to get the United States into a league of nations. Possibly it will be an association of nations, possibly a world court. But league or association or court, the irreconcilables believe that it would be the Wilson covenant minus article 10, plus express stipulations that America would not be responsible for the enforcement of the Versailles treaty.

The reaction of the Senate leaders to the delay of the House in passing the joint resolution for peace with Germany is to hold up the passage of the emergency tariff measure. This measure is near to the hearts of mid-western Congressmen, who are suspected of having a sneaking regard for the Hughes position. It is a question whether the threat of Senate delay on the emergency tariff may not work.

LOVE OF LEAGUE ACADEMIC.

For the Representative's love of an intangible league of nations is more or less academic and platonic, while the way the Representative loves his job is passionate and substantial. And the emergency tariff bill in Congress is supposed to be one of the few things that will be done for the farmer who has the Representative's job to give. It is a nice bit of politics.

And the President, who is supposed by certain Senate leaders to be slowly moving toward an alliance with our European allies in an association to keep the world peace, may be using the delay in developing a European policy to give the American people time to forget the rancors of the campaign. With the education of the people away from a league of nations receding, the league becomes more and more probable.

Every week sees some small wedge biting into the Senate's anti-Wilson policy. The appointment of the American "observers" at the conference of the Allies is a small wedge. And the fact that George Harvey, most irreconcilable of all the anti-Wilsonites, is to sit in that conference is a most deadly bit of diplomacy. For, sitting in the conference, George Harvey will be brought to see the wisdom of the conference and the need of more power to protect American interests in Europe. If Harvey is converted to the policy of further commitments for America, the Senate will follow.

This is the essence of the Harding victory. The President is no crusader. He will not be Rooseveltian in his clashes nor Wilsonian in his uncompromising position. He will not go over the heads of the Senate leaders to the people in a thunderclap.

Yet he realizes that the Senate intellectuals—Lodge, for instance, and BORAH and JOHNSON—sometimes act as if they considered Harding not quite big enough for the job. He is in the act of "showing them," most politely, even most affectionately, that he is big, really, enough for the job. Hence his quiet gesture of delay in matters relating to the treaty. Hence his tentative position with the people; not against the Senate, but on his own account for his own policy. Hence the daily strengthening of the hand of Hughes. Hence the counterplay of the Senate against the House.

It is not a row; nothing like it. The situation is a pleasant bit of political jockeying.

But the significance lies in this: President Harding, being his own master at the moment, is gently working out a foreign policy which

will land America in whatever league, association, or court Republicans like Root, Hughes, Nicholas Murray Butler, Wickersham, and Lowell decide shall be established upon the debris in Europe. That big, fundamental fact is growing more obvious every day.

Harding has not ditched the irreconcilables. But he is letting them use an awful lot of gas while they stand at the curb and blow out their cylinders. They may run clear out of gas and have to be hauled in. Harding is a kind man. He will take care of them.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2435) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent the dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table, with the other amendments to the bill, to be taken up at the proper time.

Mr. REED's amendment was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, as follows:

Insert the following after section 202:

"Whenever it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that merchandise upon which an import duty is levied by the United States is being commonly exported from the United States and is being commonly and generally sold in the countries to which exported at less than the same class or kind of merchandise is being sold or offered for sale in the United States, then the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue an order suspending and setting aside any import duty or tariff upon the importation of the same or similar articles of merchandise into the United States, said order to remain effective so long as the condition aforesaid exists."

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, the question before the Senate at the present time is, Shall the farmers and live-stock growers of America be given protection? The Democratic Party in the Underwood-Simmons bill gave protection to practically every manufacturing institution in this country. They made one exception. They put farming machinery on the free list, and they told the farmers they were putting it on the free list in order to give them cheaper farming machinery and recompense them for the losses which they sustained by having their products put on the free list. That was an insult to the intelligence of the American farmer, for the genius of the American farmer has led the whole world in improved farming machinery and we never have imported any foreign farming machinery. The question is, Shall the farmers be given protection the same as the manufacturers are receiving to-day at the hands of the Democratic Party under the Underwood-Simmons bill?

There is but very little difference in the discussion that has taken place on the floor of the Senate on the emergency tariff bill in the last few days than that which the American people have listened to for more than a hundred years. For ever since the foundation of this Government men and parties have divided on this great question according to their viewpoint of life, or from political expediency, or their own selfish interests.

The protectionist believes that the prosperity and happiness of our country depend on protection; that this country can not reach its full greatness as a nation without protection to American labor and American institutions.

The free trader believes that the best interests of the country are served by a free-trade policy that throws our ports open to the trade of the world; or a tariff on what he calls the finished product, and free trade on the farm and range products of the country that he calls raw material.

The question of free trade and protection, Mr. President, has been responsible for more strife in this country than all other political questions combined. Next to slavery, it was more responsible for the Civil War than all other questions combined. For years the North and the South were at the breaking point over the right of the Government to collect duties on imports.

At the beginning of this Government the Democratic Party was the strong protective party of the Nation, but with the growth of slavery in the South it drifted toward free trade, and long before the Civil War it became a radical free-trade party. So bitter was the South against protection that when the Confederate constitution was drafted it provided that protection should be unconstitutional, so that if the South had succeeded in the Civil War the Confederate States would have been a free-trade country by constitutional provision. Section 8 of the Confederate constitution reads as follows:

SEC. 8. The congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for revenue necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be paid to promote or foster any branch of industry, and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the Confederate States.



It is not strange, Mr. President, that the South, with its slave labor, should have been opposed to protection, for the only excuse for protection in this country on any industry is the difference in the cost of production that is made up by the difference in the price paid for labor here and abroad. Give the manufacturers, the farmers, the miners of this country labor as cheap as it is in foreign countries and they will not need any protection, for they will be able to compete with the whole world. But few, if any, of our industries can exist long without protection if the American scale of labor is to be maintained. I am unable to understand the man who would be willing to see labor in this country forced to accept the measly pittance that is paid to labor in the Old World. Labor has always been paid a higher price in America than in any other country on earth, so it is not strange that the manufacturing industries of the North fought for protection while the South, with its slave labor, fought for free trade. Nor is it strange, Mr. President, with the slave interests dominating the South, that the contest between the North and the South over the question of free trade and slavery grew more bitter until we became involved in the greatest civil war the world has ever known.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that protection wrought great hardships upon the people of the South with its slave labor. But free trade worked equally as great hardships upon the people of the North, that paid the highest price for its labor of any country on earth. And, as I read the history of our country, I am forced to the conclusion that after all the war between the North and the South was inevitable, and that we are a bigger and better country to-day because the differences between the North and the South were fought out on the battle fields.

The traditional free-trade policy of the Democratic Party is but a relic of slavery. It is not to be wondered at that more than half a century should have passed away before there was any radical change in the people of the South on the question of free trade and protection, for the Civil War left a condition in the South that was little better than slavery. But labor organizations, together with the World War, have brought about a change in the price paid for labor in many lines of industry in the South until to-day the South, like the North and the West, is forced to fight for protection in order to save its industries from ruinous competition with foreign countries.

It was Henry Clay who said that the question of free trade and protection would never be settled until it was settled on the side of protection; but I am not predicting, Mr. President, that this country is any nearer a settlement of the great question of free trade and protection than it has been for the past hundred years.

But all the free trade this country has ever known the Southern States are responsible for, for it is the solid South that has dominated the Democratic Party and shaped its free-trade policy. That there is a growing sentiment in the South for protection I am sure must be admitted. But the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party in Congress to protection for the agricultural and live-stock interests at this time, when they are in the most deplorable condition that has ever existed in their history, is evidence that the leaders of that party are not going to accept any opposition to their traditional free-trade policy.

That there is a force, however, they must reckon with in the South is evident, Mr. President, from the activities of the Southern Tariff Association. At their convention in the city of Atlanta, Ga., January 27, 28, and 29, 1921, which President Harding and Vice President Coolidge were invited to attend, resolutions were unanimously adopted favoring the passage of the emergency tariff bill.

In speaking of that convention the Southern Tariff Advocate has this to say:

The invitation extended by 24 Southern governors and governors elect to attend the Southern Tariff Congress at Atlanta January 27, 28, and 29, which is reproduced in this issue of the Advocate, is a most unique document and historians of the future will record it as the prelude to the great movement to bridge the industrial chasm between the North and the South and to bring us in closer relationship with the executive and administrative branches of Government at Washington.

The Southern Tariff Congress is perhaps the first movement in the history of the South that meets with the unanimous approval of all political, agricultural, industrial, and commercial factions, and it is predicted by those giving serious thought to the matter that the deliberations of that body will result in forging the link that will bind the interests of the industrial South with those of all other sections in such a manner that tariff legislation of the future will be levied without discrimination to any class of industry and that its burdens and benefits may be equally shared by all.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the congress held at Atlanta, Ga., in January of this year by the Southern Tariff Association, which President-elect Harding and Vice President-elect Coolidge were invited to attend, marks an epoch in the history of America on the tariff question. In order that the activities of the

Southern Tariff Association may be preserved in the records of the Government, I ask that the invitation to President Harding and Vice President Coolidge, and the double page of the Southern Tariff Advocate containing the names of the 24 governors and governors elect who signed that invitation be printed at this place in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The invitation referred to is as follows:

SOUTHERN GOVERNORS URGE HARDING AND COOLIDGE TO ACCEPT INVITATION TO SOUTHERN TARIFF CONGRESS.

HON. WARREN G. HARDING,

President elect of the United States, Marion, Ohio:

HON. CALVIN COOLIDGE,

Vice President elect of the United States, Boston, Mass.:

We sincerely urge you to accept the invitation of the Southern Tariff Association to address the Southern Tariff Congress in session at Atlanta, Ga., January 27, 28, and 29, 1921.

We invite you to be the guests of the South and assure you a warm welcome and best wishes of the southern people for a peaceful, happy, and prosperous administration.

Hugh M. Dorsey, governor of Georgia; Thomas W. Hardwick, governor elect of Georgia; Thos. F. Kilby, governor of Alabama; Thos. E. Campbell, governor of Arizona; Charles H. Brough, governor of Arkansas; Thomas C. McRae, governor elect of Arkansas; Sidney J. Catts, governor of Florida; Cary A. Hardee, governor elect of Florida; Edwin P. Morrow, governor of Kentucky; Jno. M. Parker, governor of Louisiana; Albert C. Ritchie, governor of Maryland; Leo M. Russell, governor of Mississippi; Frederick D. Gardner, governor of Missouri; A. M. Hyde, governor elect of Missouri; O. A. Larrazolo, governor of New Mexico; Merritt C. Mechem, governor elect of New Mexico; T. W. Bickett, governor of North Carolina; J. B. A. Robertson, governor of Oklahoma; R. A. Cooper, governor of South Carolina; A. H. Roberts, governor of Tennessee; A. A. Taylor, governor elect of Tennessee; W. P. Hobby, governor of Texas; Pat M. Neff, governor elect of Texas; Jno. J. Cornwell, governor of West Virginia.

Mr. GOODING. I also ask that the resolution unanimously passed by the Congress of the Southern Tariff Association and the telegram to Senators from the Southern States urging them to support the emergency tariff bill may be printed in the RECORD following the invitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution and telegram are as follows:

The following resolutions were passed at the closing session of the congress:

*Resolved*, That we send the following message to President-elect Harding, the Congress of the United States, and the American people:

This convention, called by 16 southern governors and composed of delegates from 18 Southern States, represents every important southern industry, and truly reflects the thoughts and aspirations of the people of the South regarding the great economic questions now confronting the country. We express our profound appreciation for the generous recognition given this congress by President-elect Harding by his interview to the press, assuring us that the "incoming administration is highly sympathetic with the aspirations of the people of the South." We believe with him in "prospering America first," and in "protecting our home markets in such a way as to assure American standards of production and American standards of living." We join with him in the hope and we express the belief that his administration will be in the interest of all the people, without favor to any class, section, or interest, and in so doing we believe that it will remove all cause for sectionalism and prejudice. We pledge ourselves and our association to cooperate in the achievement of this worthy purpose.

The visit of Vice President-elect Coolidge and his splendid address to us is a distinction never before shown a southern convention by a Republican Vice President. We hope and believe that it will be productive of a better understanding and of a better service on the part of us all for our common country.

Due largely to foreign competition, all the southern industries represented in this convention are in a desperate condition, including agriculture, live stock, mining, manufacturing, and forest products. These industries are all essential to the prosperity of our country in peace and to its success in war. The producer has been encouraged to increase production in order to meet the world demand for food, clothing, and other products. He has done so at great cost. He is now unable to market his product at a living price or to obtain the credit to hold it for a better market. This condition will inevitably lessen future production and cause great hardship and sacrifice.

We are for the full employment and a living wage for the wage earner, a living price for products of the farm, the mine, and the factory. We believe that it is essential for the assurance of prosperity to have an adequate tariff that will protect the product and industry of our people against foreign competition. In the long run, this will mean cheaper cost of living to the consumer as well as greater buying power.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

We therefore petition the President and Congress:

To enact at the earliest date possible the emergency tariff law with the Senate amendments, and to enact a permanent tariff law that will afford both revenue to the Government and protection to agriculture and industry.

*Resolved*, That the following telegram be sent to Senators UNDERWOOD, HARRISON, SIMMONS, and others:

The Southern Tariff Congress in session here, representing all Southern States and industries, believes that the prompt adoption of the emergency tariff bill with the Senate amendments will be of very great advantage to southern agriculture and industry. The convention has approved this measure by unanimous vote and directs me, as president of the congress, to request your support of the measure:

(Signed) JOHN H. KIRBY,  
President Southern Tariff Association.



## SENATORIAL FILIBUSTER.

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Southern Tariff Association in convention assembled that it has been charged by Senator ASHURST, Democrat, of Arizona, that certain southern Senators are seeking to defeat the Fordney emergency tariff bill by dilatory tactics; and

Whereas we regard the passage of this measure of vital necessity to save the producers of the South and West from financial distress and ruin: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by this convention*, That we most earnestly beg to implore the Senators from the South and West to permit this bill to come to an immediate vote in the Senate: Be it further

*Resolved*, That we here now express our most solemn protest against any filibuster by either individual Senators or any party on this measure: Be it further

*Resolved*, That this association at once wire this resolution to all southern and western Senators.

## ORGANIZATION PLAN.

*Resolved*, That the chairman appoint a committee of three persons for each State to secure indorsement of our declaration of principles and affiliation with our association by all organizations within their State.

That the chairman be further authorized to appoint a large delegation to appear before the proper congressional committees at Washington in the interest of southern welfare.

## LIVE-STOCK INDUSTRY.

Whereas the live-stock industry of the South has suffered from foreign competition of sheep, goats, wool, mohair, cattle, frozen meats, hides and skins, dairy, and all other live-stock products, to the extent that the industry can no longer survive unless given recognition in tariff legislation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress of the United States to include the above-mentioned products in the list of articles needing protection.

## AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

We specifically urge the enactment of such tariff legislation as will adequately protect the following agricultural products from foreign competition: Vegetable oils, citrus fruits, tobacco, rice, sugar, peanuts, honey, Egyptian or long staple cotton, onions, potatoes, grain, and all other products produced on the American farm which are affected by importations from foreign countries.

## FOREST PRODUCTS.

We also favor adequate tariff schedules for all products of the forests, including lumber, naval stores, wood pulp, and other products affected by foreign competition.

## MANUFACTURES.

We believe in the fullest development of our manufacturing industries and favor such tariff schedules as will equalize the cost of production in this country with that of foreign countries where wages and standards of living are below our standards, and recommend that the following industries be considered in the next tariff bill of the Congress of the United States: Glass manufacturing, cotton manufactures, furniture, burlap, coal-tar dyes, flour milling, foundry and machine shops, fertilizer, creosote oil, and all other manufacturing industries whose progress and prosperity may be hampered by importations of competitive products from foreign countries.

## MINERAL INDUSTRY.

Whereas the necessity and urgency of protection of American industry is now the paramount issue before the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the mineral industry of this country is seriously jeopardized by the invasion of foreign minerals; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Southern Tariff Congress was appointed on January 26, 1921, for the purpose of reporting upon the needs of the mineral industry for protection, and the said committee having reported that the following minerals, among others, are urgently in need of protection from foreign competition: Antimony, pyrite and sulphur, potash, graphite, tungsten, flint, talc, manganese, magnesite, lead, clay (kaolin), feldspar, whiting, marble, zinc, monazite sand, ferro-alloys, thorium, iron and steel, fuller's earth: Be it

*Resolved by the Southern Tariff Congress, in joint session assembled*, That it lends its unqualified indorsement to the protection now being sought by the mineral industries now seeking protection before the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved by the Southern Tariff Congress, in joint session*, That the Congress express its unqualified approval of such protection on all such minerals as will equalize the cost of production here and abroad, and pledges itself to lend its best efforts toward that end.

## SOUTHERN TARIFF ADVOCATE.

*Resolved*, That we heartily commend and indorse the Southern Tariff Advocate, the official publication of the Southern Tariff Congress. Its circulation, which now includes all members of the United States Congress Tariff Commission, members of the legislatures of Southern States, and the industrial and economic leaders of the South, should be expanded. We urge all citizens, and especially industries interested in securing proper tariff recognition for the South, to liberally support it with advertising and subscription patronage. We especially commend the work of its editor, Mrs. Ida M. Darden, and extend the thanks of this convention for the valuable service she has rendered the South as director of publicity of the Southern Tariff Association.

## MANUFACTURERS RECORD.

*Resolved*, That we express our appreciation to the Manufacturers Record and its editor, Col. Richard H. Edmonds, for the generous support given this organization and for the unselfish campaign they have consistently and unceasingly waged for the past 40 years in the interest of the producer and the wage earner.

## THE PRESS.

*Resolved*, That we thank the press of the city of Atlanta and the press and magazines of the South for the recognition extended us, and thank the good citizens of Atlanta for their gracious hospitality.

## INDUSTRIES SHOULD STATE TARIFF REQUIREMENTS.

*Resolved*, That the various organizations and committees, representing the agricultural, live-stock, mining, manufacturing, and forest-product industries be earnestly requested to file briefs and resolutions with the schedules committee of the Southern Tariff Association at its

Washington office, definitely and authoritatively stating their tariff requirements in order that a broad and comprehensive campaign of publicity may be carried on to better acquaint the political and economic leaders of the Nation with the problems of southern industry as especially relates to tariff matters. (Under authority of the foregoing resolution representatives of the glass, Egyptian-cotton, cotton-manufacturing, mica, zinc, and other industries submitted resolutions calling for specific tariff rates on their various commodities which were adopted by the congress and will be printed in pamphlet form at an early date for use of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and for the information of the individual Members of Congress in framing and disposing of the permanent tariff measures.)

## COOPERATION OF INDUSTRIES.

*Resolved*, That we hereby pledge our mutual support, each to the other, in securing the enactment of legislation to protect each and every American industry against destruction by foreign competition.

(Signed)

N. A. SHAW,

Chairman.

C. PATOUT BURGUIERES,

Vice Chairman Agricultural Division.

MARION SANSOM,

Chairman Live Stock and Dairy Division.

GEORGE A. SHARPE,

Chairman Mineral Division.

CHAS. ADAMSON,

Chairman Manufacturing Division.

W. A. LOGAN,

Chairman Foreign Trade and Shipping Division.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG,

Chairman Resolutions Committee.

The foregoing resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Southern Tariff Congress in session at Atlanta, Ga., January 29, 1921.

SOUTHERN TARIFF ASSOCIATION,

JOHN H. KIRBY, President.

J. A. ARNOLD, Manager.

Mr. GOODING. I also ask that the memorial presented to the Ways and Means Committee by the Southern Tariff Association may be printed with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorial referred to is as follows:

MEMORIAL PRESENTED TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS BY SOUTHERN TARIFF ASSOCIATION.

To the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives:

The Southern Tariff Association represents affiliated industries from Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia—18 Southern States. The number of these affiliated industries is 57, embracing virtually every line of activity in the States mentioned, as follows:

Agricultural: Cottonseed and vegetable oils, cattle, sheep and wool, goats and mohair, Egyptian cotton, citrus fruits, honey and beeswax, onions, peanuts, grain, cane and sugar, rice, potatoes, hides and skins, tobacco, dairy products, lumber, naval stores, poultry.

Manufacturing: Cotton goods, flour milling, saddles and harness, chemical dyes, glass, burlap, penholders, haircloth, slaughtering and meat packing, pencil leads, epsom salts, macaroni, fertilizers, fish oil, furniture, foundry products, wood pulp, iron and steel, shoe manufacturing, potato flour, and starch.

Mineral: Asbestos, barium, barytes, bauxite, cement, clay, feldspar, ferro-alloys, gypsum, graphite, marble, monazite, manganese, mica, potash, pyrites, quicksilver, sulphur, talc, zinc.

These industries represent two-thirds of the wealth of the South and have directly dependent upon them two-thirds of all the inhabitants. Unless these industries function and prosper the 18 States in which they are situated must rest commercially stagnant, their business inert, and their progress definitely halted.

The whole southern territory is now in the throes of an economic disaster of unparalleled intensity. It has been in this condition for many months. Agriculture, the great basic industry, lies prostrate. The acres are among the most fertile on the earth, but the owners of them are besought by bankers and by merchants, by statesmen and by economists, to let lie fallow the lands that for a hundred years have clothed the world. With unanimity they are advised against the vast production of which they are capable. The wealth that can be created must not be created because there is an economic status which impoverishes a whole people as a penalty for thrift in the fields. Nor in the vast production of edibles is the situation different, since a flood of foreign and competing goods is pouring into the ports, destroying markets and depriving agriculture of any possible profit. Equally stricken are the stock and wool industries, so vital to the sustenance of the Nation.

Not less alarming is the status of the manufacturing industry. The great textile establishments are either closed or are working on part time. The glass industry is not functioning. The dye industry, an essential element in the national defense, is threatened with paralysis. It would be difficult to decide which branch of manufacturing is in the worse condition.

The mineral industry is to all intents and purposes entirely inoperative. During the war the necessities of the conflict revealed hidden sources of essential minerals in southern territory, the development of which promised not only a substantial increase in the national wealth but sure elements of defense in the event of war, going far to determine the complete self-sustenance of the Nation. These industries are on the verge of extinction.

We can not wholly acquiesce in the conclusion that these alarming and ruinous conditions are wholly the result of natural laws, against which it would be folly to contend and to prevent the operation of which would be futile. On the contrary, we are convinced—and are prepared to prove—that the economic disaster is the consequence of forces the hardness of whose compact can and ought to be softened by the intervention of the Government, impartially made operative. Not only are we convinced that these forces have facilitated domestic trade paralysis, but it is our firm belief that unless they are controlled immediately conditions, if possible, will become progressively disastrous, with widespread bankruptcy, unemployment, and civic restlessness. A flood of cheap imports is wrecking the markets.



We favor, therefore, the immediate enactment of such tariff schedules as will equalize the cost of production in this country with that of foreign countries, and that will take up the differentials, now favorable to foreigners, in exchange and transportation costs, so far as may be consistent with the public welfare, such schedules to be so placed as to distribute fairly the burdens and benefits among all industries without discriminating against any section, class, or product, to the end that there may be maintained American standards of living in every line of effort.

We respectfully call the attention of your committee to the fact that there is an economic emergency comparable in its immediacy and potential destructiveness to any military exigency with which the Nation has been confronted. The World War has no more violently disturbed the geographical status of the world than it has changed the economic map. The wealth of countries has been swept away in great sections of the earth. This has resulted in a credit famine, which necessarily expresses itself in lower standards of living and reduced costs of production abroad. A decade ago there was hope that an equalization of production costs might be anticipated by higher standards of living in other nations, but the Great War has postponed that expectation and relief can be effected now only by the imposition of tariffs sufficiently high to afford real equalization. The competition of pauper production in its several degrees impoverishes those who attempt to meet it, and all alike, in such circumstances, are joined in promiscuous ruin.

This situation is aggravated and intensified by a breakdown in exchange. In several of the countries which are flooding or are threatening to flood this country with their cheap goods the purchasing power of their unit coin at home is three or four times as much as the cost of the same unit in international exchange. The effect is to give each of these countries a prohibitive protection against American products, while it serves as an actual bonus on exports to America.

The South comes into competition agriculturally with the cheapest labor on earth. Her products are the products likewise of the Orient and semitropical nations, where living conditions are such that labor is the cheapest of all things. The South has been paying, and would like to continue to pay, an American wage to those who toil in the fields, as well as those who labor in the factories and mines, but it can not pay five or ten times the wage that is paid by foreign competitors and economically survive.

Each of the industries signing this memorandum is submitting to your committee severally and independently a specific statement of its condition, together with statistical tables which reveal the actual difference in cost of production in this country and in foreign countries. Those figures are based on actual market quotations and on other information which it has been possible to collect. The emergency has developed so rapidly that the investigating agencies of the Government, such as the United States Tariff Commission, have been unable to secure reliable statistics up to this time, nor is the Tariff Commission in a position, we are informed, to make an investigation within such time as is available. We respectfully suggest to your committee, however, that the figures which each of the affiliated industries is submitting is subject to substantiation either by witnesses which each particular industry can provide or by additional information now being procured. The schedules suggested represent in every case the minimum levies which practical men in the industries involved feel will permit them to do business on an equality with foreign producers, but with no advantage over them.

We regret that we can not visualize for your committee the widespread devastation which has been spread over the South by the flood of imports. No words can paint the picture. The breakdown in the cottonseed market alone is known to have taken more than 25,000 children away from country schools. Additional thousands have been compelled to withdraw from other institutions of learning. Banks find their commodity collateral no longer sufficient to guarantee loans made. Scores of financial institutions, chiefly serving rural communities, have been forced to suspend operations. Thousands of farms have been abandoned. Others are so mortgaged that it will be years before they are released. Innumerable mines are shut down and tens of thousands of men are out of employment. Factories that thrived with life a year ago are deserted, or nearly so. Thousands of cattle, essential to the national life, have been hurried to the slaughterhouses or are being trekked into foreign territory. It is as if an epidemic, contagious and infectious, paralyzing all enterprise, initiative, and progress, had swept over the land.

In these circumstances we urge upon your committee the necessity of immediate relief. The disaster is progressive. It will not do to stay it months hence. With all the emphasis of which we are capable we urge that relief be given now, at once. Our people are convinced that it is within your power, by the imposition of equalizing tariffs, at once to control the catastrophe and restore economic vitality. The unemployment is promoting social unrest. Even brave men fear to go ahead, for they are ignorant of the conditions under which they must do business. They can not contract with assurance. They can not arrange for production while there still hovers over them the actuality or the probability that foreigners will meet them at their doors with similar goods at prices far below the domestic cost of production, omitting all thought of profit. There are establishments in which the fires are kept burning low, at heavy loss each day, in the hope and expectation that speedily and without delay the Government will interpose its mighty arm in defense of its industrial establishment and levy the customs imports which alone can revive activity. We respectfully urge upon you, therefore, in this grave emergency that the customary processes of legislation be reverted and that by joint resolution or otherwise the Congress make immediately operative such tariff schedules as your committee may recommend as desirable, subject to modification upward or downward, as subsequent full investigation may show to be wise. We urge that you act first and investigate afterwards. The essential information is already available, the minutiae of detail can later be assembled.

In full appreciation of actual conditions, we pledge you that we can and will set the wheels of industry in the South to moving almost immediately following the granting by you of the relief we seek. Among our members are those who intend to become active at once. They are leaders in their respective industries. One man alone, who has been forced by economic necessity to send thousands of cattle to his Mexico ranches, is prepared, on the enactment of suitable legislation, to invest not less than \$500,000 promptly in the purchase of cattle. Others are prepared to open their closed glass factories, their shutdown mines, their silent factories of all kinds. Agricultural leaders also have yet time to prepare their fields for the harvests of this year. We pledge the committee that the turn of the industrial tide back toward normal will begin the revival of that which the imposition of the suggested schedules will assuredly induce.

We further put on record our intention to organize the entire South around an American tariff policy to equalize cost of production and maintain American standards of living, on economic grounds, irrespective of party. Our efforts will be educational along these lines, but the surest proof of the wisdom and enduring soundness of the policy we advocate will be found, we are confident, in the immediate and lasting effects which the operation of that policy will produce. The South asks only for equal treatment. Given that, she does not fear competition.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHERN TARIFF ASSOCIATION.  
JOHN H. KIRBY, President.

Mr. GOODING. I will read merely the introduction of the memorial presented to the Ways and Means Committee.

To the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives:

The Southern Tariff Association represents affiliated industries from Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia, 18 Southern States. The number of these affiliated industries is 57, embracing virtually every line of activity in the States mentioned.

The 57 affiliated industries have signed the memorial through their presidents or secretaries.

Mr. President, we may not be any nearer a permanent settlement of the tariff question to-day than we have been for the past hundred years, but the activity of the people of the South gives me much encouragement, and if I am not mistaken the American people in every State in the Union are growing tired of having the business interests of this country made a political football to suit the whim of any party.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOODING. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator was just discussing the congress of the Southern Tariff Association, as I understood him. They had numerous representatives before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, I understand. Did the Senator read the hearing of those representatives before the Ways and Means Committee of the House?

Mr. GOODING. I did not read from the hearings, but read the memorial sent by the association to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very reliably informed by a member of that committee that every representative of the Southern Tariff Congress who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee stated that he voted the Republican ticket at the last election. That qualifies them, I take it, to be protectionists. So far as my own State is concerned, the name of which was included in the list read by the Senator from Idaho, there is no sentiment in Mississippi for protection, especially such as is provided in this bill.

Mr. GOODING. I will let the Senator answer to his own people on that question.

Mr. HARRISON. I have done so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. GOODING. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish the Senator would bear in mind that the membership of the Southern Tariff Association includes the governor of every Southern State elected by Democratic votes.

Mr. GOODING. Its membership embraces every governor who was elected two years ago and all those who were elected last November. It is a very encouraging sign that the people of the South are changing their opinions in regard to protection, and that 24 of the great southern governors indorsed a resolution unanimously in favor of the emergency tariff bill. That is more encouragement than I thought we would receive.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I do not want to impose on the time of the Senator, but once before the Senator from North Dakota included such a list of governors of the Southern States as vice presidents of such an association. I have known, so far as the governor of my State is concerned—and his name was included—that he certainly does not favor any such measure as that now pending. I do not believe that he knew what the Southern Tariff Association congress stood for when he allowed the use of his name, and other governors, with a few exceptions, are in the same boat.

Mr. GOODING. Well, the South seem to be satisfied with their governors.

But then, again, Mr. President, I am not unmindful that there is a new force behind the Democratic Party to-day that is fighting against protection for the farmer and the live-stock grower. I refer to the international bankers of the country, who have had on a propaganda ever since the emergency tariff bill was introduced opposing the measure and emphasizing the importance of our foreign trade, and it must be admitted, Mr. President, that the international bankers of the country are a mighty force to-day, for they represent billions, not millions,



and they have been able to fill the newspapers of the whole country with their opposition to the emergency tariff bill, and at the same time have accentuated the importance of our foreign trade. It is easy to understand why the leaders of the Democratic Party are fighting so bitterly against protection to the agricultural and live-stock growers at this time, for they are receiving much encouragement from the international bankers of the country, who they know will be a mighty factor in the coming campaign in the interests of free trade on farm and range products.

No one doubts the importance of our foreign trade to the life of the Nation, but it is not necessary to sacrifice any of our foreign trade to maintain a healthy condition in the exchange of trade with foreign countries. The Democratic Party has always been ready to sacrifice the agricultural and live-stock interests of the country; they have never been a friend to the farmer; they have always called the farmer's products raw material, and one of their arguments has been that they were putting all raw material on the free list to give the manufacturer cheaper raw material. There is no such thing as raw material in farm and range products. When the farmer's products are ready for market they are his finished product and they are just as much a finished product as the products of the mills. All require labor to produce, and all should be treated alike by this Government. If the manufacturers of this country are to be protected from the cheap labor of foreign countries, then the farmers have a right to demand the same protection. The principle of protection is either right or wrong. If it is right to protect the manufacturers to save them from ruinous competition with foreign countries, then it is right to protect the American farmers.

The principle of protection can not live in America with one half of the industries protected and the other half on the free list, any more than slavery could have existed with this country half slave and half free. If the manufacturers want protection they had better get busy and fight for it as a principle, for if they are going to be protected the farmer is going to be protected, and the laborer who works in these mills must realize that if his labor is to be protected from foreign competition then the laborer who works upon the farm has a right to demand protection for his labor. There is going to be protection for all in this country or protection for none.

Then, again, there are some manufacturers who are not big enough and broad enough to understand that the best market in the world and the best customer in the world is the American farmer and the American live-stock grower. Our foreign trade is less than 10 per cent of our domestic trade, and yet for their own selfish interests these international bankers, together with the speculators and a few of the manufacturers, like the Democratic Party, would destroy the great agricultural and live-stock industries for their own selfish ends.

It is not strange, Mr. President, that the whole industrial system of America is paralyzed and broken down—for free trade on the farm and range products of America has paralyzed and destroyed the purchasing power of the American farmer and live-stock grower. There is not a farmer in America to-day who can sell his products for what they cost to produce. He is without a market, without money, and without credit. When you break down and destroy the prosperity of the productive forces in America, who are the producers of practically the entire wealth of this country, you may expect ruin and disaster to follow along other lines. This country is never prosperous unless the farmers of the country are prosperous.

After all, it is not hard, Mr. President, to understand why the Democratic Party has always opposed protection to the American farmer, for they have had a class of labor in the South that up to a few years ago cost but very little. From their viewpoint, measured by conditions that have existed in the South in the past, the farmers do not need any protection. The whole story is told in the remarks of the senior Senator from Mississippi when the emergency tariff bill was under discussion at the last session, in which he said:

I can meet all comers in the cotton field with white men upon the quarter-deck and Negro laborers in the field, although paying them four times what is paid to the felahien of Egypt and six times what is paid to the peasants of India, and beat Egypt and India at their own game; but in order that I may do so I ask simply to be left unhampered and untaxed, except in so far as the Government shall levy a tax for revenue purposes alone for the payment of governmental necessities. This is all I ask, and if I ask more I ask something that I have no right to ask.

The Senator was perfectly safe in making that statement, because in India the coolie laborer works for the measly pittance of 10 cents a day. But the trouble is, Mr. President, that the nigger refuses to remain a nigger any longer. He is demanding the same right to live and the same pay for his hire as others receive for the same class of labor, and I hope we

are passing that period in American history when labor, be it white or black, can be held in peonage in any State in the Union.

The senior Senator from Mississippi is a consistent free trader. He does not believe that the agricultural interests should be given protection. He stated upon the floor of the Senate time and again when the emergency tariff bill was under consideration that you can not make a wrong right by committing another wrong, which he holds we will do if we give protection to the agricultural interests of the country. It is my judgment the Senator from Mississippi is far nearer right on this question than those who would give the manufacturing interests protection and at the same time force the farmers and stock growers to sell their products in competition with the whole world.

It was Henry Clay who called protection the American policy and free trade the British or colonial policy. It is through that American policy, Mr. President, of protection to American labor and American industries that we have become the mightiest Nation on earth. Through protection we have built up an American standard of wages and an American standard of living that is not equalled in any other part of the world. And through this great principle of protection we have built up a standard of citizenship in this country that is the joy, the pride, and the admiration of every true American.

I am not unmindful, Mr. President, that the world is passing through a readjustment period following the greatest war of destruction civilization has ever known. And I am not holding the Democratic Party responsible for all the conditions that exist in this country to-day. But in a measure the Democratic Party is responsible for the serious conditions of the farmer and the live-stock grower, for they put the farm and range products of the country on the free list to make them cheap, and God knows it has made them cheap enough; for in one short year the farmers and live-stock growers have lost on their products more than \$7,000,000,000. This is the greatest loss the agricultural and live-stock interests in this country have ever sustained; but it is no exception to the rule, Mr. President, for every time the Democratic Party has had an opportunity they have always put farm and range products of this country on the free list, and it has always broken down and wrecked the agricultural and live-stock industry and brought ruin and disaster to the country.

Go back and read the history of our country and you will find no exception to this rule. At times when we have had a free-trade measure on our statute books disaster has been averted for a time by war and great events, like the discovery of gold in California, but when there is nothing to interfere free trade has always brought ruin and disaster to the country. The following is what Henry Clay had to say to the American Congress in 1824, describing the industrial distress which prevailed as a result of a free-trade measure enacted into law April 27, 1816:

The general distress which pervades the whole country is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native product, by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation, by our diminished commerce, by successive rnthrashed crops of grain perishing in our barns for want of a market, by the alarming diminution of the circulating medium, by the universal complaint of the want of employment and a consequent reduction of wages of labor, and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of property in the Nation, which has sunk 50 per cent. It is most painful to me to dwell on the gloom of this picture; but I have exaggerated nothing. Perfect fidelity to the original would have authorized me to throw deeper and darker hues.

In speaking of conditions which existed in the country in the late fifties, soon after the Democratic Party had passed one of their free-trade measures, Horace Greeley in an editorial in the New York Tribune had this to say:

Who's hungry? Go and see. You that are full fed and know not what it is to be hungry, perhaps never saw a hungry man, go and see. Go and see thousands of men and women, boys and girls, old and young, black and white, of all nations crowding and jostling each other, almost fighting for the first chance, acting more like hungry wolves than human beings in the land of plenty, waiting until food is ready for distribution. Such a scene may be seen every day between 11 and 2 o'clock around the corner of Orange and Chatham Streets, where charity gives a dinner to the poor.

The best example of what free trade and protection means in this country, in my judgment, is the two administrations of Grover Cleveland. During Grover Cleveland's first term the Republicans had control of Congress, so that he was forced to administer the Government with protective tariff laws. During his first term, when he administered the Government with protective tariff laws, he paid off \$260,000,000 of the national indebtedness and we had good times. And then the people elected Grover Cleveland a second time and gave him a Democratic House and Democratic Senate, and he convened Congress in special session and repealed those protective tariff



laws and passed a free trade measure known as the Wilson-Gorman bill.

No human tongue can tell the story of the misery and suffering of those four years when Grover Cleveland tried to administer the Government with free trade laws. Instead of paying off any of the national indebtedness, he was forced to borrow \$230,000,000 to pay the running expenses of this Government. One hundred and seventy-seven railroads, with mileage enough to reach twice around the earth, could not meet their obligations and were forced into the hands of receivers. Those four years witnessed 60,000 commercial failures with liabilities amounting to \$1,000,000,000. One hundred and seventy-five national banks closed their doors, and the balance of trade turned ruinously against us. If capital alone had suffered, it would have been bad enough; but the real suffering came to the army of unemployed in the great cities where free soup houses had to be established to prevent death from starvation.

And then, Mr. President, the Underwood-Simmons bill was passed on the 3d of October, 1913. I wonder if the leaders of the Democratic Party have forgotten the winter of 1914, when more than 3,000,000 men were thrown out of employment, and charity, in this land of plenty, was again forced to feed the poor. Free soup houses had to be established in the principal cities of the country, and, like Banquo's ghost, Coxey's army came back to remind us that free trade was again the law of the land. Then the Great War burst upon the world, and instead of being flooded with foreign importations we were called upon to feed the armies of Europe, and so we forgot all about free trade and hard times.

I have another editorial from the New York Tribune. This is dated August 12, 1920, and it says:

When the war came to Europe this country, as the business world generally recognized, was headed for an industrial crash. The Underwood tariff bill went into effect on October 3, 1913. In the beginning of 1914 its effect began to show. For six months the tide of imports rapidly rose, and incidentally American factories began to close. Is there doubt of what would have happened if Europe had not been compelled to turn to making war supplies? The tariff question is now little discussed, but men of foresight are making guesses as to what will happen here when Europe reaches the full production toward which she is swiftly moving.

Well, it has already happened, Mr. President, and Europe has only just made her beginning toward full production; yet every line of industry in this country is paralyzed. At this time I want to call the attention of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber especially to the serious conditions that exist in the live-stock industry in America, which has been brought about largely by excessive importation. For comparison I am using the year 1912, before the country was affected in any way by any free-trade measure, as compared with the years 1919 and 1920.

The total value of live animals imported into the United States in 1912 was \$7,580,555; in 1919 and 1920, the total value of live animals imported into this country was \$89,559,584. I am unable to find where any fresh meats were imported into this country in 1912, but for the years 1919 and 1920 I find there were imported fresh meats to the total value of \$42,108,624. Wool importations for the year 1912 amounted to 193,400,713 pounds, and in 1919 and 1920 I find that it had increased to a total of 705,510,475 pounds. If any Senator on this floor thinks there has been no dumping going on, let me read him the figures on the importation of wool for the first three months of the present year.

In January, 1921, there were imported 21,169,480 pounds of wool; in February, 1921, there were imported 42,885,968 pounds of wool, or a little more than twice as much as in January; in March there were imported 98,103,089 pounds of wool, almost five times as much wool in the month of March as in January. The total importation of wool for the first three months of 1921 amounted to 162,158,546 pounds. And it is estimated, Mr. President, that there are at the present time more than 100,000,000 pounds of wool on the way to America.

If this is not dumping, I do not know what you would call dumping. Every importer and speculator in the country has known for a long time that there has been more than a two years' supply of wool in America, without the importation of a single pound from foreign countries.

For more than a third of a century, Mr. President, my life's work in the West has been that of a farmer and live-stock grower. I saw wool when it was on the free list, under Grover Cleveland's second administration, sell in the State of Idaho for an average of 7½ cents a pound. The common price for sheep in those days was \$1 per head. At times fat sheep shipped to the eastern markets did not bring enough to pay the freight, and for four long years the live-stock industry had to fight for its existence. Many of the growers were thrown into bankruptcy and their sheep and cattle sent to the slaughtering pens.

But as destructive as those four years were to the live-stock industry in the West they do not compare with the conditions that exist to-day, for there is no market for wool to-day at any price. Thirty-five per cent of all the wool clip of 1919 is unsold, much of which is in the hands of the growers. It is estimated that 90 per cent of the clip of 1920 is unsold, the greater portion of which is still in the hands of the growers. The majority of the clip of 1921 is now shorn and ready for market, but can not be moved at any price. For some time fat sheep that have been shipped to market have not brought enough to pay the freight and the cost of feed for fattening, to say nothing of the original cost of the animal, which is all lost in many cases. Unless sheep are in prime condition when shipped to market in many cases they do not pay the freight.

There is no sadder thing in this life than to see those who have made a good fight for almost half a century and who have grown old in the pioneer work of the West become penniless in their old age by a public calamity that in a way might have been at least partially averted.

There is no thought any longer in the West of trying to save the men who are in the sheep business. A few will survive, but the vast majority of them must find some other occupation. The effort out West to-day is to save the industry and save the banking institutions, so that it will be possible some day, let us hope, for the live-stock industry of the West to be brought back to a prosperous condition.

Mr. President, I sometimes wonder if the American people realize the importance of live stock to the life of the Nation and to civilization. The first speech that I listened to after I had been given the privilege of the floor of the Senate was an address delivered by the minority leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD, on Muscle Shoals, in which he dwelt on the importance of the fertility of the soil. Let me read you a few lines of what he had to say about the importance of the fertility of the soil to the life of the Nation itself:

It has been said by the wisest statesmen that the overthrow of the great nations of the world can only come from two sources, one a conquering army and the other the depletion of the fertility of the soil. Of the two I am inclined to believe that the depletion of the fertility of the soil is a more certain death sentence to the life of a nation than to be overwhelmed by a conquering army, because with the conquering army the life and spirit of the nation may yet live, but with the depletion of the soil and the lack of food the only thing that can be expected is the downward trend of the national vigor and the national life until the national existence is snuffed out.

The fertility of the soil is not only a mighty factor in the life of the nation, but it has its influence upon the individual at all times. Show me a country, or any part of any country, where the fertility of the soil is exhausted and the farmer has to struggle to produce enough to sustain life and I will show you a community where the civilization, like the soil, has gone backward. For it is hard to be a good citizen in any country where a fight must be made to keep the wolf from the door.

The minority leader, Senator UNDERWOOD, is more responsible for free trade being forced upon the American farmer and live-stock grower than any man in public life at this time, and yet he seems to understand the importance of the fertility of the soil. When it comes to Muscle Shoals, he is ready to spend \$10,000,000 to build a nitrate plant, but he is not willing to give one penny of protection to the agricultural and live-stock interests of the Nation. The question, Mr. President, that the American people must answer very soon is this: Is the live-stock industry worth saving? For it can not go on as it has in the past, building itself up only to be torn down in a few years by a free-trade policy. Already in the last year more than 10,000,000 head of live stock from the breeding herds have been shipped to the slaughter pens. Unless something can be done to encourage the live-stock growers—and it must be something more than the emergency tariff bill—God only knows what is going to happen. The live-stock grower can not go on. His stock must be fed every day; they must be watched over and cared for, and he can do but little to reduce his expenses. There is only one way to stop the expense or reduce it to any extent, and that is by sending his stock to the slaughtering pen. In this way he can end it all. This is what they are doing to-day as fast as they can get their live stock ready for market, and if the breeding herds of this country are to be impaired much more it will take years before there can be much prosperity in America.

Out in the great West—and when I say the great West I include the Northwest and the Southwest and all the arid portions of our country—nature has given but very little humus to the soil. Only two or three crops can be grown from the raw soil before the fertility is exhausted, and then it becomes necessary to plant alfalfa or clover or some other crop that live stock consumes for a few years in order to build up the fertility of the soil. When this is done these arid lands become as rich as any farm lands in the whole world. This principle



is true in every State in the Union, Mr. President. Live stock must either come in contact with the soil or the manure from the barnyard must be hauled out upon the field or there must be a rotation of crops that live stock consumes if the fertility of the soil is to be maintained.

Nature in its wisdom has fixed certain principles that if they are accepted and followed make possible the existence of civilization. It gave us live stock as nature's remedy for keeping up the fertility of the soil. Practically all the crops grown from the soil which the human race consumes exhaust the fertility of the soil at an alarming rate, while the vast majority of crops consumed by live stock are fertilizers—they feed the soil; they give it the nitrogen and humus it requires which makes possible, with proper rotation, the growing of those crops the human race requires to sustain life.

So it is not a question, Mr. President, of whether we will save the live-stock industry, it is a question of whether we will save the life of this Nation, because it can not live and retain its virile force, as the Senator from Alabama has well said, unless the fertility of the soil is maintained. It is true that in a small way commercial fertilizers can be used, but this has not proved a success in the Old World without live stock. In all the old countries no leases are entered into for farms without a provision requiring a certain number of animals to be kept upon the farm or a certain amount of barnyard manure to be used upon the farm. Experience has taught us that the tilling of the soil can not be maintained without nature's simple remedy that it has given for the use of mankind.

But instead of doing anything to help the live-stock industry in this country, the Democratic Party, as soon as it comes into power, proceeds to put the live-stock industry in free competition with the whole world, which has always brought ruin and disaster. I wonder, Mr. President, how long we are to go on and use the great industries of this country for a political football.

The live-stock industry can not exist in this country without protection, for live stock of all kinds can be produced in every country on earth cheaper than they can be grown here in America. Every other Government on earth, with the exception of our own, realizes the importance of the live-stock industry. In Australia they lease land so cheap to flockmasters that the sheep are fed the year round for 7 cents a head and cattle for \$1.25 a head. Over there it has been the custom of the Government to lend the live-stock grower money at a low rate of interest, and in some cases to build a part of the fences to protect the live stock. The Australian woolgrower is able to ship his wool from Portland, Seattle, or San Francisco to Boston to-day for \$1.65 a hundred over our own railroads, while from the intermountain country the woolgrower must pay \$3.25 to \$3.46 a hundred pounds. The haul from Portland to Boston is 500 miles farther than it is from Idaho points, yet the Australian grower ships his wool to Boston for less than half the price the flockmaster in my State or any other of the intermountain States must pay.

Down in the Argentine sheep are fed the year round for 20 cents a head and cattle for \$2.50 a head. There labor is paid the princely sum of from \$15 to \$20 a month. The freight rate from Argentina to Boston is from 90 cents to \$1.40 a hundred—about 25 per cent of what the flockmasters of the intermountain States must pay.

From Africa, which has become one of the important wool-growing countries of the world, the woolgrower can ship his wool to Boston for very much less than the price paid by the growers in the West. In Africa the flockmaster pays his labor the princely sum of from \$1.75 to \$5 a month. Almost every country on earth, with the exception of America, encourages its live-stock industry. They fully understand that without nature's remedy for keeping up the fertility of the soil it soon becomes exhausted, and the result that the Senator from Alabama so well described is the penalty every nation must pay that permits its soil to become exhausted.

When will we learn these great truths, Mr. President, and give the live-stock industry a chance to live, not for itself but that the development of this country may go on and the fertility of our soil be maintained and the vigor and the spirit of our national life guaranteed beyond the question of a doubt?

Mr. President, 20 of our great States can be properly called seaboard States; most of the great cities in these States can be reached by water transportation from foreign countries. The great city of Philadelphia can also be reached by ocean steamers. It is safe to say that the population of these cities that can be reached by water transportation from foreign countries is more than 30,000,000. I am going to make this statement, Mr. President, and I believe it is true, that there is not a farmer in any country in the Old World but who can ship his farm products into these great cities cheaper than many of the farmers

from adjoining States; that is especially true when you get as far west as Chicago. I want to make another statement—that when you get as far west as the Rocky Mountains there is not a farmer on earth, whether it be in the Old World or the New, but who can ship his products to the great cities of this country that can be reached by water transportation cheaper than the farmers west of the Rocky Mountains. I want to make another statement: There is not a farmer or live-stock grower on earth who does not employ his help for much less than what the farmers in America must pay. Take the average paid for farm labor in the Old World, and the American farmer and live-stock grower is compelled to pay on an average ten times more for a day's work than the average farmer of the world.

Here are a few of the freight rates paid by foreign farmers and live-stock growers, and also the freight rates which our own farmers have to pay:

*Cargo rates from foreign ports to Atlantic ports per 100 pounds.*

Shipping point.	Corn, wheat.	Wool.	Meats.	Potatoes.	Sugar.
Argentina.....	\$0.225	\$0.90	\$0.04		
Sweden.....				\$0.45	\$0.325
Denmark.....				.45	
Germany.....				.45	.325
Cuba.....					.18
Australia.....	.875	3.20		.45	.325
New Zealand.....	.875	3.20			
Bermuda.....				.93	

Onions from Bermuda are 40 cents per 100 pounds.

*Freight rates on farm and range products—destination New York City except where designated by letter B, in which case destination is Boston—in cents per 100 pounds.*

#### COMMODITIES.

Shipping point.	Corn.	Wheat.	Wool.	Potatoes.	Sugar.	Meats.
Maine.....	\$0.74	\$0.74		\$0.665		
Ohio.....			\$0.80			
Michigan.....				.57	\$0.57	
Minnesota.....	.555	.555	1.05	.63	.63	
Iowa.....	.58	.58				
Illinois.....						\$0.65
South Dakota.....	.74	.74				
Intermountain States:						
Utah.....						
Nevada.....			3.365 B			
New Mexico.....			3.255 B			
Arizona.....			3.435 B			
Idaho.....	1.09	1.09	3.465 B	1.42	1.45	4.27
Pacific Coast States:						
Washington.....	1.09	1.09	1.665	1.675	3.165	4.30
Oregon.....	1.09	1.09	1.665	1.255	3.165	4.30
California.....				1.675	1.725	4.40
Southern States:						
North Carolina.....	.565	.565		.62	.785	
Georgia.....						
Florida.....	.705	.705		.95	1.515	
Louisiana.....	.585	.585		1.085	.825	
Alabama.....	.78	.785	1.80	1.00	1.10	.885

Also, here are the prices paid for labor in foreign countries and the prices paid for labor in this country:

FARM AND PLANTATION TABLE OF WAGES PAID IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES AT PRESENT TIME.

[Authority: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.]

#### COUNTRY AND WAGES.

China, \$3 per month and food.  
 China, \$20 per year and food.  
 India, 8 to 15 cents per day without food.  
 Japan, 40 cents per day, average.  
 Australia and New Zealand, \$72 per month without board.  
 Argentina, \$12 to \$15 per month without board.  
 Great Britain, \$48 per month without board.  
 South Africa, \$1.75 to \$5 per month.  
 West Indies, 50 cents per day without board.  
 Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, \$25 per month with board.  
 United States (West), \$100 per month with board, \$5 per day without board.  
 NOTE.—Western States now reduced to \$65 per month and board for live stock.  
 NOTE.—In India and China a coolie laborer's food consists of a half bushel of rice a month.

#### WAGES OF MALE FARM LABOR PER MONTH.

North Atlantic States: \$50 with board; \$75 without board.  
 South Atlantic States: \$35 with board; \$50 without board.  
 North Central States east of Mississippi: \$50 with board; \$70 without board.  
 North Central States west of Mississippi: \$60 with board; \$80 without board.  
 South Central States: \$36 with board; \$51 without board.  
 Far Western States: \$75 with board; \$100 without board.

Tell me, if you please, how, with cheaper freight rates and labor ten times as cheap on an average as what the American farmer must pay, what hope is there for agriculture and live stock to exist in America under free trade?



## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

## RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 11, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 9), 1921.*

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles H. Holtzman, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of William P. Ryan.

## COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

## FIRST DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

John C. Cannon, of Chicago, Ill., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois in place of Harry W. Mager.

## EIGHTH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

George W. Schwaner, of Springfield, Ill., to be collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Illinois in place of John L. Pickering.

## TWENTY-EIGHTH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

Bert P. Gage, of Warsaw, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the twenty-eighth district of New York in place of Vincent H. Riordan, resigned.

## REAPPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

## SIGNAL CORPS.

Rex Walter Minckler, late first lieutenant (temporary captain), Infantry, to be first lieutenant with rank from May 4, 1921.

## APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

## FIELD ARTILLERY.

First Lieut. Ivan Leon Foster, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Housan Wayne Duncan, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

First Lieut. Howard Nichols Merrill, Infantry, to be captain with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Glen Dison Gorton, Quartermaster Corps, to be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 9), 1921.*

## BUREAU OF MINES.

H. Foster Bain to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

## COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Levi M. Willcuts, for the district of Minnesota.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 10, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, O God, for the light and promise of the incoming morn. Teach us that there is no common day, that all time is sacred and all bread is sacrificial. Even in the darkest night there is a brightness which the pure in heart can see. As we are largely measured by the objects we pursue, may we cease to do evil and learn to do well. Lead forward our higher and best natures and deepen our faith in things not seen. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## REFERENCE OF PETITIONS.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on page 1242 of the RECORD, right-hand column, I am reported as having introduced certain petitions of various posts of the American Legion, urging relief for disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines. Those various petitions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I indorsed upon them a reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman allow that to go over until to-morrow?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I will say that we have never handled that legislation. It is in the nature of a pension or compensation for disability incurred in service in the war. The Committee on Military Affairs provides for the Regular Establishment, ordinary maintenance and organization.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was not a member of the House when the original legislation was enacted and knew nothing about the procedure. It seems to me that that sort of petition could not, under the rules, properly be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the war-risk legislation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, the House should not continue a bad procedure.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it ought not to have originated in that committee, but it did; and since that time all such legislation relating to war risk has gone to that committee.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It would not go to the Committee on Military Affairs in any event.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice also that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAYS] introduced a petition of citizens of Alva, Mo., urging the President to call a conference of the great powers to consider the question of disarmament, and that the petition was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. At first blush that would seem to be the proper committee.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Disarmament includes much more than reducing the number of war vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reference being changed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, JOHN W. RAINEY, Representative elect from the State of Illinois, has been detained at his home from the beginning of this session by a serious illness in his family. He is here, and I ask that the oath of office be administered to him.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of private parties to the Mari-veles quarry within the limits of a United States military reservation in the Philippine Islands, and to permit the working thereof by the persons entitled thereto, provided military necessities permit;

S. 426. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1, chapter 209, of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 27, entitled 'An act providing when plaintiff may sue as a poor person and when counsel shall be assigned by the court,' and to provide for the prosecution of writs of error and appeals in forma pauperis, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 866);

S. 813. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets NW.;

S. 52. An act for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J.;

S. 472. An act for the relief of William B. Lancaster;

S. 1300. An act for the relief of the heirs of Agnes Ingels, deceased;

S. 723. An act for the relief of James Duffy;

S. 594. An act for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims;



S. 546. An act making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid, at the request of the President, in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims and Senate Report No. 764, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session; and

S. 809. An act to give preference right of employment on construction work on United States reclamation projects, and preference right of entry on public lands, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below.

S. 594. An act for the relief of certain ex-service men, whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 472. An act for the relief of William B. Lancaster; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of private parties to the Mariveles quarry within the limits of a United States military reservation in the Philippine Islands, and to permit the working thereof by the persons entitled thereto, provided military necessities permit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 426. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1, chapter 209, of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 27, entitled 'An act providing when plaintiff may sue as a poor person and when counsel shall be assigned by the court,' and to provide for the prosecution of writs of error and appeals in forma pauperis, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 866); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 723. An act for the relief of James Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 809. An act to give preference right of employment on construction work on United States reclamation projects to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Irrigation.

S. 813. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 52. An act for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to furnish water to applicants and entrymen in arrears for more than one calendar year of payment for maintenance or construction charges, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 13, 1914.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question before we go into Committee of the Whole? A great many Members have asked what the program for the balance of the week is going to be. Will the gentleman from Wyoming mind telling us what he proposes?

Mr. MONDELL. We hope to bring up immediately after this bill the bill regulating trading in futures reported by the Committee on Agriculture. After that a bill reported by the Interstate Commerce Committee having to do with the landing of cables.

Mr. GARNER. And that will probably take the balance of the week.

Mr. MONDELL. It is possible that one other bill from the Committee on Agriculture, to be selected by that committee from bills reported by them, will be taken up.

Mr. GARNER. What about the deficiency bill; will that be considered this week?

Mr. MONDELL. That will be given the right of way, if possible, when it is ready. It may be ready on Friday. It was my hope that we could recess over Saturday if the business was in a condition to warrant it, but if the deficiency bill should come in on Friday and remain unfinished I am not sure that we would be justified in adjourning over Saturday. We might; that would depend on how the Members felt about it.

Mr. BRAND. Can the gentleman give us any information as to whether the Public Buildings Committee is going to be allowed to consider bills for post offices?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not pretend to control the action of the Public Buildings Committee, but I will say very frankly to the gentleman that while I had hoped that we might at this session take action whereby public-building construction might at least be authorized for cases of emergency, I am rather inclined to think that in view of the situation of the Treasury, the way matters stand generally throughout the country, the great demand for reduction of expenditures, I am rather inclined to the opinion that we should not report any public-building bills.

Mr. BRAND. I ask the question because I read in a rural carrier paper published in this city and a local paper in my district, 600 miles away, that it had already been decided by the majority not to report out of the committee any public-building bill at this session.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know whether the committee has acted upon the matter or not. I have expressed my personal views to members of the committee who made inquiries of me as to my opinion.

Mr. BRAND. In a great many instances in the last three years post-office buildings have been condemned by the Government, and we are anxious to know if there is not going to be some relief in those cases.

Mr. MONDELL. There are some very trying situations in the country. There are situations that I am inclined to think ought to be relieved, and yet the gentleman realizes that as a practical matter in legislation of this kind it is difficult to say where the line should be drawn. Once we start, I think we would not stop short of a general public-building bill, probably a very big one.

While the people of my State in common with the constituencies of all of us are quite earnest in this matter, and properly so I think in many cases, while I sympathize with their view, and while I am not one of those who view proper public-building programs as pork-barrel legislation or appropriations, I am inclined to believe that until the state of our finances is improved and we know a little more definitely how we stand and what the outlook is for the future we should not enter upon new construction or new authorizations.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 5010, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5010) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AUTOMATIC MACHINE RIFLES.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, repair, and maintenance of automatic machine rifles, or other automatic or semiautomatic guns, including their mounts, sights, and equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, to remain available until June 30, 1923, \$375,000.

#### TANKS.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, maintenance, and repair of tanks and other self-propelled armored vehicles, to remain available until June 30, 1923, \$450,000.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I note in the paragraph read just before this providing for automatic machine rifles and also in this for tanks it is provided that the fund shall remain available until June 30, 1923. I presume that is necessary because of the length of time that it takes to fill such contracts?

Mr. ANTHONY. My understanding is that the largest part of this money for automatic machine rifles will be used for the development of the larger calibers of machine rifles that are now in use; and, as the gentleman says, a good deal of it is in the way of experimentation and development, and therefore the money is asked to run over until the next fiscal year.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the same thing is true of tanks?



Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and that is done with a number of manufacturing appropriations in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking a question. I notice a provision in the bill which provides for the payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, and so forth. Is there any provision in the bill which provides for the payment to individuals for accident or loss of life incident to the training of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; these claims are all small claims under a certain amount and the department is confined to the payment of these small items. Any larger claims they would be unable to pay.

Mr. SNELL. What is the policy of the department in regard to the life or accident to individuals? Is there any provision anywhere relative to that?

Mr. ANTHONY. My opinion is it requires a special act of Congress.

Mr. SNELL. No matter how small?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman this. There are a large number of claims which were sent up by the War Department to this committee to be included in this bill, claims which have been disallowed in the accounts of the disbursing officers and other officers on account of technicalities and the amount taken out of the officer's pay merely, as I say, because of some technicality. We did not put them in this bill, because we felt the Committee on Claims had jurisdiction and the Committee on Claims should pass an omnibus bill clearing up 100 or more of these claims that have arisen because of the war, where the department has withheld pay of the officer on some technical ground.

Mr. SNELL. We are beginning to get some in the Committee on War Claims, and I wondered whether there was special policy in regard to this?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; claims of that nature are not paid under general authority in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. Every one comes under a special act?

Mr. ANTHONY. They are only small claims for damages taken care of.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers in connection with the National Guard, \$85,000.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPEAKS: Page 60, strikes out lines 12 and 13.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on this amendment, and I should like to know how much time I will be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have sat here quietly during the past month deeply interested and carefully respecting all the traditions and customs of the House concerning new Members participating in the debates. This is the first word I have uttered in the Congress of the United States. I can not in five minutes more than outline what I have in mind when offering this amendment, and I anticipate that before I have proceeded very far it will involve a discussion which will consume considerable time. I want to say, first, that the National Guard is a subject which is very near to my heart, one with which I have been closely identified for a period of 40 years. I trust you will pardon this personal reference, which seems necessary in order that you may understand my viewpoint. I served in the National Guard for a period of 40 years, passing through all of the grades from enlisted man to brigadier general. I commanded a battalion in Porto Rico during the Spanish-American War, a brigade on the Mexican border, and for eight months a brigade in the World War. I was not permitted to continue in that service, and if you will allow me to continue this discussion for a while you may get some idea as to why I was not permitted to go to France with my organization.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKS. I should like to present my ideas relative to our military system and organization, but unfortunately am reminded that the time will not permit. I am a believer in a small Army. [Applause.] I voted for an Army of 150,000 men. I voted for an Army of 150,000 men when that question was up simply because there was no amendment offered which proposed a smaller number.

I was really prepared to go down to 100,000 men, prompted by the fact that the National Guard is rapidly approaching its former strength and esprit de corps.

First, I think this question of great armaments to resist some imaginary foe is largely buncombe. I believe that to a considerable extent it is the propaganda of interests which profit by war and military activities in general.

I assume that we can all agree to the proposition that Germany is now, or under the terms of the peace treaty will be, effectively disarmed. Thus we find the leading exponent of the theory that great armies and armaments are necessary to promote economic progress and insure national security deprived of her powerful weapons, once her supreme pride and which was at the same time a constant menace to world peace. Every resource of that splendid country—material, intellectual, and even spiritual—was prostituted to the barbarous doctrine that might makes right and that the mailed hand was the final arbiter in the settlement of international questions and difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I object to an extension of 10 minutes. I would not object to five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I modify the request that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin modifies his request, that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. SPEAKS. Now we find Germany completely disarmed, powerless to wage offensive warfare, and impotent to defend her borders from aggression against even inferior nations.

Mr. LINDBERGER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPEAKS. Not for a moment, because it will be pretty difficult for me to keep my line of thought, anyhow.

Yet I make the assertion that Germany to-day in her disarmed condition is far safer than she ever was at the very peak of her military preparedness. If Germany will scrupulously observe the terms of the peace treaty and deal justly and righteously with the world, she will have no occasion to fear attack from any quarter.

Gentlemen, I submit to your best judgment and sense of square deal this question: Would not the United States—and doubtless France and Belgium—throw their moral support in forceful manner to the side of Germany in the event that she were unjustly menaced or assailed?

Germany can now devote her energies, her resources, and her marvelous talents to peaceful pursuits and demonstrate that disarmament is not only practicable but also highly desirable. Germany can now peacefully occupy a place on the international side lines and observe the United States and other leading nations in the great world contest for supremacy in armament and military expenditure.

But I must hasten to the point I have in mind in connection with this bill. I have moved to strike out lines 12 and 13, which seek to appropriate \$85,000 for travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers in connection with the National Guard.

Now, the regular military appropriations carry sums amply abundant to pay all of the expenses of the officers and men of the Army who may be called upon to perform any duty or service in connection with the National Guard. My chief purpose in offering this amendment is to have you preserve the line of demarcation between expenditures for the Army and those for the National Guard. Do not permit this constantly increasing and unjustified overhead expense, which you are all complaining about and have not the moral courage to prevent, from being saddled onto the National Guard.

We had on the 1st day of May upward of 90,000 National Guardsmen in the United States. The expectation is that on the 1st day of June it will number 100,000. I am saying that after some investigation of my own, and I note in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee that the Chief of the Militia Bureau at that time stated it was their hope that the guard would number 100,000 men by June 1, 1921. Now, there are many ways in which the money appropriated for military purposes is absolutely wasted, and I am anxious to keep the appropriations made for the Military Establishment entirely separate as it relates to the Army and the National Guard in order that we know just what each organization is costing the Nation.



Now, do not mistake my thought relative to having the National Guard under control of the regularly constituted military authorities. I understand the necessity, under the law, for Federal supervision and control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman wish to discuss his amendment?

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKS. My purpose, as I stated before, is to prevent the unnecessary, the unjustifiable overhead charge relating to our general military system, and particularly to the Regular Army, being saddled upon the National Guard. The National Guard appropriation at the figures fixed is ample, and even for a guard of 125,000 or 150,000, which I think will soon be realized, the present appropriation will undoubtedly be sufficient. I give notice right now that I propose to offer a similar amendment on lines 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKENZIE. The item that the gentleman now desires to strike out is for pay of Regular Army officers, commissioned and noncommissioned, who are sent out into the country—their travel pay?

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKENZIE. Travel pay for these Regular Army officers who are sent out into the various States to inspect the National Guard and look after the money appropriated for the National Guard?

Mr. SPEAKS. No; not to look after the expenditure of money. That is provided for. There is an officer in each State whose business it is to check that up.

Mr. McKENZIE. But does the gentleman object to the Federal Government having a sort of supervision over them?

Mr. SPEAKS. No. As a matter of fact, we encourage supervision. We have always invited that in the National Guard, and even now we encourage supervision carried to any degree in order that the War Department and Congress and everybody else may be fully informed as to the opinion of the War Department with respect to the guard. In the hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs on Army reorganization Gen. Pershing, on page 1509, spoke as follows:

The National Guard performed very excellent service, considering the limited opportunities which they had for training in the past. They never received, in my opinion, the whole-hearted support of the Regular Army. There was always more or less prejudice against them, and many of our Regular officers failed to perform their full duty as competent instructors, and often criticised where they should have instructed. The National Guard people resent this, and very properly so.

No, indeed; I have absolutely no objection to the Army supervising and, so far as they can, instructing the National Guard.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I did not hear all the gentleman's argument, because I came in only a short time ago. May I ask him if his amendment would not have the effect of doing away with all instruction of the National Guard by the Regular officers?

Mr. SPEAKS. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it has absolutely no application to that. The thought I have is, I want the Federal Government—that is, the War Department—to give any instruction they think necessary, but I want the expense of that instruction taken out of the regular appropriation for the Army, and not saddled onto the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS]. If we are to have any Federal supervision at all of the National Guard, this item of \$85,000 for travel is absolutely necessary, because under this item is paid the travel of the Federal officers who are assigned to the National Guard of the various States and of the noncommissioned officers, of whom there is a large number—several hundred of them. The National Guard has millions of dollars' worth of Federal property in its custody. I suppose it would not be an exaggeration to say that there is

\$50,000,000 worth of Federal property under the control of the National Guard.

This item permits Federal officers to inspect these organizations once or twice a year, traveling over all the States and into all the towns checking up the property and verifying the accounts of State officers having them in charge.

It also covers the travel pay of the tactical instructors of the National Guard. The other day I had four or five officers of the National Guard of Pennsylvania at my office strongly urging an increase in this very item of travel pay. They claim that in the State of Pennsylvania, for instance, there was one sergeant instructor assigned by the Regular Army to one town, and he also had under his supervision companies in four or five other towns. They said the force was so small and the appropriation so low that the instructors could visit these towns only once or twice a year, although the National Guard wanted them to visit these companies frequently, or at least more frequently than they do. I agreed at that time that it would be wise to increase this amount, but we did not do it. They wanted \$185,000, but we allowed them \$85,000. It would be fatal to any supervision of the guard at all to strike this item out of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three minutes more. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not quite know what is meant by the term "Federal officers," because that might include civilians.

Mr. ANTHONY. No. In this sense it means officers of the Federal Army.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You could say "officers of the Regular Army." The term "Federal officers" would include civilians. Therefore I move to strike out the words "Federal officers" and insert "officers of the Regular Army."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "Federal officers and noncommissioned officers" and insert "officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Page 60, line 12, strike out "Federal officers and noncommissioned officers" and insert in lieu thereof "officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, is that an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The other amendment is to strike out the section. In that sense it is a preferential amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does my amendment stand?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. It was agreed to. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses, sergeant instructors, \$60,000.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SPEAKS. No; that is a mistake. It should be line 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPEAKS: Page 60, line 17, strike out the line "For expenses, sergeant instructors, \$60,000."

You can depend upon it that whenever there is any criticism the officers of the Army take refuge in the statement, "Well, it is Congress that is doing it, and Congress evidently knows what it is undertaking to do."



There appears to be a thought in the minds of some Members that I am trying to discourage Federal supervision and Federal instruction of the National Guard. The thing that I am trying to do—and you will find later that it is important—is to prevent the placing of unjust overhead expenses connected with our Military Establishment on the guard. I do not know what I can say to impress you, but I am convinced as the result of my experience that the principle is right, and I know I am voicing the sentiment of National Guard officers generally. I agree with the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], who states that sergeant instructors are desired. All I am asking you to do is to pay the expenses of these sergeant instructors who belong to the Regular Army from the Army appropriation, which should properly pay that expense, instead of having it charged to the National Guard.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPEAKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is it not a fact that these instructors are delegated to the National Guard for the particular interest of the National Guard, and is it not a fact that it is a mere matter of bookkeeping after all?

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes; but the gentleman does not grasp my point.

Mr. LINEBERGER. That is exactly what I am attempting to do, and it is for that reason that I rise to interrogate the gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKS. I am trying to keep a line of demarcation between appropriations for the National Guard and appropriations for the regular service.

Mr. LINEBERGER. It is only a form of bookkeeping, and the money which is here appropriated, as I understand it, is essentially for the benefit of the National Guard. Why should it not be taken from the National Guard fund?

Mr. SPEAKS. I will tell the gentleman why. You will find that if you persist in that system you will have the National Guard saddled with an overhead charge that will not only make it a burden to the country but make the organization unpopular.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPEAKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. What we are trying to do is exactly what the gentleman says he wishes to do. We are trying to make a line of demarcation in these appropriations. Now, the salaries of these sergeant instructors, of whom there are 227, are paid out of the appropriations for the support of the Army, but this item of \$60,000 will pay for their quarters and heat and light in the towns where they are detailed for duty with the National Guard.

Mr. SPEAKS. But the item is charged to the guard.

Mr. ANTHONY. So that is the reason for the separate appropriation.

Mr. SPEAKS. And the Army has abundant appropriations available to pay all these expenses.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no; it has no appropriations whatever available to pay the expenses of a sergeant instructor in your town.

Mr. SPEAKS. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but although it may not be under this specific heading we all know that the amount of the Army appropriation is more than ample to pay all the sergeant instructors now detailed to the States or who may hereafter be so detailed.

The National Guard in the past has not been treated fairly by either Congress or the Army, and I propose to do everything within my power to prevent discrimination against it. Its record of accomplishment has never been properly appreciated by the Federal authorities, and only the inspiration of patriotism has encouraged officers and men to continue their sacrifices and efforts until the organization simply commands public confidence and respect. The experience in the World War which disclosed 11 National Guard divisions on the battle line in France, while the Regular Army numbered but 7 divisions, should certainly convince the most prejudiced and skeptical that the great organization of citizen soldiery is not only efficient but that the system is thoroughly practical for national defensive or offensive purposes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 34—

Mr. ANTHONY. We should vote first on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending to this paragraph.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. May we have it read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPEAKS: Page 60, line 17, strike out "for expenses of sergeant instructors, \$60,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 34 for the purpose of offering an amendment at the end of line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to the page indicated for the purpose indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to returning to the page. I understand the gentleman has an amendment. Can he not offer it here?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I think it should be offered at line 10, page 34.

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the gentleman's amendment is out of order anyway, and he may offer it to any part of the bill to which he desires to offer it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I do not think so. Does the gentleman object to returning to page 34?

Mr. ANTHONY. I dislike to return—

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I will ask the gentleman to withhold his objection and let me make a statement.

Mr. ANTHONY. I withhold the objection.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I have made some investigation of the truck situation since the matter was discussed yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I want to offer an amendment if it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not tell whether it is in order until it is offered.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I move to strike out the last two words. I want to offer an amendment at the end of line 10, page 34, where this proposition came up yesterday. The chairman of the committee says he will have to object to returning to it. I do not know if this amendment would fit in at the point in the bill where we are now. If so I propose to offer it.

I made an investigation yesterday and this morning with reference to the helplessness of some of the departments of the Government in trying to obtain any of the great number of trucks that are absolutely going to rack and ruin in the military depots under the charge and custody of the War Department. I have a letter here from the Bureau of Mines that explains their difficulty in trying for four months to get six light trucks to be used at the different experimental and rescue stations of the country. I have also a letter here from Col. Hartsborn, who is the director of sales, and who is selling and disposing of the War Department material. In this letter he says:

I regret to inform you that I know of no means under existing law whereby vehicles may be transferred by the War Department to the Department of the Interior.

Leading Members of Congress this morning have expressed great surprise that this is a fact, and some of them think there is a law whereby these automobiles may be turned over to the Department of the Interior, but there is no law authorizing it, and unless the House takes the bit in its teeth there is not going to be any law. The other departments are entitled to these automobiles. Congress ought not to find itself helpless in this matter, but it should give directions that these motor vehicles be turned over, and the only way out that I know of is for Congress in this bill to say to the Secretary of War, "You are directed and authorized to turn over to the Department of Interior so many trucks in so many days." If you do not do so they will never get them. I want to propose that kind of an amendment. I think it would be proper to go back to page 34.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Has it not always been in order for Congress to pass a law authorizing the transfer of such trucks as the gentleman asked for, and is it not a matter that ought not to have escaped Congress so long?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. BLANTON. The great trouble is that the War Department will not declare them surplus. If they would declare them surplus they could be turned over.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Oh, they have declared some of them surplus and they put them in the States, in the good roads department, where in many States they have more than they need and are deluged with them.

Mr. BLANTON. I am with the gentleman in his proposition.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I think that Congress ought to give the authority that the gentleman speaks of now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to state to the gentleman from Indiana that I offered an amendment yesterday to indicate to the gentleman on that side of the House that there would be no objection or any point of order raised on this side of the House to an amendment of that kind, and I trust that the gentleman can get his amendment adopted.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I can understand how the gentleman's amendment—and mine also—being directed to a specific community, failed. It was objectionable.

Mr. ANTHONY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Can we go back to this item of the bill for a specific purpose only—that of the gentleman from Indiana offering his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee so decides.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 34 for the purpose of offering this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to return to the item on page 34 for the purpose of offering a specific amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKENZIE. If this amendment is now up for consideration, whether or not a similar amendment can be offered as an amendment to that amendment, and so on down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has asked permission to return to page 34 for the purpose of offering a specific amendment to a particular paragraph, and permission was given by the committee. The gentleman has offered the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 10: The Secretary of War is hereby directed and authorized to transfer without charge, within 30 days after the approval of this act, to the Department of the Interior six serviceable, light, motor trucks.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I find in this Bureau of Mines letter to me a statement that they have traveled almost all over the Nation, following the War Department motor-car sales, in an effort to find cars suitable for their purpose and which they so much need. They went to New Albany, in my State, where there were hundreds of cars and trucks advertised for sale, but they found they were dilapidated old scrap iron, which they could not use. They traveled to New Jersey for the same purpose to an advertised sale and found they were non-serviceable and could not be used. A representative of the Bureau of Mines who has been there for many years came to my office this morning and told me they were absolutely helpless. I talked with the Assistant Secretary of War this morning in the absence of the Secretary of War, and he could suggest no remedy. There is no remedy unless Congress affords it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would the gentleman have any objection in providing for the transfer of these automobiles from the War Department to the Department of the Interior, to accompanying it by a bookkeeping credit to the War Department for the value of the six automobiles?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. That would entail an appropriation to the bureau and a lot of misunderstanding about it. When the bureau comes to Congress for their appropriation they would be met by this item, and Congress has never been very lavish in its appropriations for the Bureau of Mines. The War Department has always had all that it wanted, or at least more than it needed.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We have been wasting nearly a week trying to get a little money for them and have not got through with it yet. If you are going to howl about the cost of militarism, let us have some bookkeeping showing how much militarism has cost, and how much automobiles, and how much schools, and all that sort of thing have cost.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. How much bookkeeping did you have when the department turned them over to the Agricultural Department and they turned them over to the public roads? You have got nothing in the way of bookkeeping credit there; why discriminate against the Interior Department?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am trying to do simple justice to one of them. These automobiles have been appropriated for and the appropriations charged to the War Department, and if they are required to turn them over to another department they ought to have credit for the same.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. They will have credit; it will be shown that they were turned over to the other department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For office rent, and so forth, inspector-instructors, \$9,000.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 18 and 19, page 60.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SPEAKS: Page 60, strike out lines 18 and 19.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I do this merely for the purpose of again presenting to the Members of the House the desirability and necessity for making every item of this character a charge against the Regular Service instead of the National Guard. Also for the purpose of protecting the National Guard eventually against the charge of being an extravagant organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPEAKS. I ask permission that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I regret to differ with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS] on this important subject, but I feel that we can not do enough in the way of appropriating to provide Regular Army officers to help the guard in every conceivable way. In this bill we have before us we provide for two things—brains and matériel. We have provided for brains—that is, we have appropriated for a much larger number of Regular Army officers than is consistent with a force of 150,000 enlisted men. We already have the matériel left over from the war and have provided space and care for it. Now, what are you going to do with such a large number of Regular Army officers unless you lend them to the guard?

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman permit me to answer the question?

Mr. FISH. After I get through; I will be very brief. This is money that is coming out of the National Guard appropriation; the gentleman is quite right, but the work and time of the Regular Army officers are given to the guard for the benefit of the guard and should not be credited to the Regular Army. It is done to help develop the National Guard, and I think the gentleman and myself are agreed that the Federalized National Guard is going to be the big defensive weapon of this country. In the last few months the Federalized National Guard has increased from 85,000 to 95,000. Some of us believe that by the end of the next fiscal year—June 30, 1922—we will have 150,000 in the Federalized National Guard, and we want that National Guard to be the most efficient force that Congress can make it, and if that means appropriating money in this bill to get Regular Army officers, who spend their whole time in military matters, to lend their help and their advice to the National Guard, we want to do it. It is not right to go to the Regular Army and say "loan us these men" and then ask them to pay their traveling expenses and subsistence. What the Members of this House want to know is who is getting the benefit, as it is obvious that the people who receive the benefit should pay for it. I submit that it is solely the National Guard that receives the benefit. Does not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. SPEAKS. I agree with the gentleman that the National Guard eventually will be the great defensive reliance of the Nation. I agree with the gentleman that to a considerable degree we must depend upon the Army for the system and actual instruction. I do not agree with the gentleman, however, that the pay for that service rendered by the officer and enlisted man of the Army while carrying the instructions, as the gentleman expresses it, to the National Guard should be taken from the National Guard appropriation.

Mr. FISH. I will yield no further. I think the committee understands the proposition, as they have already voted almost unanimously on it. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes.

Mr. FISH. Following up the statement the gentleman advanced with reference to the record of the guard and what they did in the war, it is a matter of interest to everybody in the House, because the guard is going to be the great defensive weapon in this country. Out of 11 National Guard divisions which went to the other side, the National Guard units had bigger casualties in killed and wounded than the National Army or the Regular Army, and that shows that the National Guard when Federalized can be depended upon to do their part



effectively. We can depend upon the National Guard, and therefore if we appropriate money to Federalize them the guard will be our first line of defense. You can not depend upon the Regular Army of 150,000 in war, because the 150,000 are not sufficient hardly for one day's battle. We have got to build up the guard, and within a few years' time it may be that the guard will amount to 400,000. Does not the gentleman agree with me as to that? There is no reason why the National Guard of this country in a few years from now, if Federalized and proper appropriations are made, should not amount to 400,000 trained men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes.

Mr. FISH. I object.

Mr. SPEAKS. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended one minute; I wish to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPEAKS. Did not the National Guard, which the gentleman described so eloquently, go to France 90 per cent, at least, under instruction of their own officers?

Mr. FISH. Quite right.

Mr. SPEAKS. The point I am making is, was it the result of the instruction brought from the Army to the National Guard? The gentleman is putting too much stress and value upon the nature and extent of the instruction which the gentleman thinks the Army is carrying to the National Guard.

Mr. FISH. May I answer that question?

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes.

Mr. FISH. This is my idea of what should be done by the Regular Army in order to bring about efficiency in the guard. You must admit that the guard officers are volunteers, they are only paid for their drills and a part of their time, while the Regular Army is paid for the whole of the day's work. I believe we should send to each guard regiment two or three officers, not one and two or three non coms. The non coms should check up all supplies and go to the captain of each company and say, "Captain, you have got enough of this or enough of that." The captain of a guard company can not do all of this work without giving up his business. I do not believe in sending one officer to a National Guard regiment, but sending three officers, one as assistant to the colonel, one as assistant to the adjutant, and one as an inspector.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I agree with the gentleman from New York, but following in line with what he has just concluded in reference to sending officers to a National Guard regiment, I am quite in sympathy with the gentleman's idea, but I invite his attention to this: If we provide in a bill for a reorganization of the Army, an unusual number of commissioned officers, more than it would seem should be supplied to an ordinary tactical organization, we are told that we have got a top-heavy Army, that we have more officers than we need, and Members will vote against it.

Mr. FISH. No; we have not voted against it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand.

Mr. FISH. We must have something to do with those officers if we have not got men. Why not send them to the guard?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am simply taking your thought for the text, which some of our brethren never seem to understand here. Some of our brethren never seem to understand why we want more officers than will supply the actual tactical necessities. And one of the reasons is given by the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], who seems to have not a personal grudge, but some other kind, against all colleagues who want a medium-sized Army, I want to say the 14,000 officers which he has insisted on providing for the Army are enough to care for the 400,000 National Guard, which number our friend from New York [Mr. FISH] says he hopes may be reached. But I want to say to the gentleman from New York and to the gentleman from Ohio that you never will increase the strength of the National Guard up to 400,000 or up to any number sufficient to provide the proper first-line protection to the country until you get out of their breast the present feeling in the heart of every single National Guard officer in the land to-day that he has not had a square deal from the Regular Army. You can not show me an officer in the National Guard anywhere in the United States to-day but who feels that he was discriminated against by the Regular Army.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Look at me. I am one of them. I do not feel that we were discriminated against by the Regular Army. There were officers we did not like. And I want to say to you that the Twenty-ninth Division was a National Guard division.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is hardly a fair specimen. I do not want the gentleman to take all my time.

Mr. HILL. And I am going to stand by this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Whenever you send a man to the Congress of the United States he forgets a lot of things. Possibly if the balance of the National Guard officers were occupying the seat of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], they, too, would forget the discrimination. But the feeling of discrimination is there, and you can not get rid of it. Write them and ask them about it.

The feeling is in the heart of practically every single National Guard organization of this land that they did not get a square deal from the Regular Army during the war. If you want the National Guard to have the right sort of feeling, such as would make them readily respond for good service, give them to understand that in the future, at least, they are going to get a square deal from the Regular Army and also from the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ORDNANCE EQUIPMENT FOR RIFLE RANGES FOR CIVILIAN INSTRUCTION.

For arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice for issue and sale in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War, in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice, in pursuance of the provisions of law, §100.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'CONNOR offers the following amendment: At the end of line 18, page 6, add: The Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to investigate the feasibility of establishing a national military park on the plains of Chalmette, below the city of New Orleans, where was fought on January 8, 1815, the Battle of New Orleans, and to prepare plans of such park and estimate of the cost therefor, and obtain such further information as may enable Congress to act upon the matter after being fully advised.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in all probability the amendment is subject to the point of order, but I believe that it is justifiable legislation on an appropriation bill. There are times and occasions when the point should not be pressed. I do not desire to criticize the rules or the precedents of the House. I know that both are the result of a growth and express the experience and wisdom of legislators since the very first page in our parliamentary history was written. But as valuable as rules and precedents are in maintaining this as a Government of law and not of men, I believe they should not be as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians, but should possess a certain elasticity which would permit meritorious legislation to be passed expeditiously when unusual circumstances warrant it. The attenuated refinements of strict parliamentary procedure, the rigid application of rule and reverential invocation to precedents may defeat a most laudable legislative and national purpose. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a few days ago in a remarkably felicitous and clear-cut manner showed the desirability of generously and liberally considering amendments that are meritorious, even when they are undeniably subject to the point of order. But back to my subject or amendment. If the point of order is not withdrawn, if I do not succeed in having the amendment adopted, I will have to press as well as I can a bill which I have introduced to effectuate my purpose of ultimately creating a national park on the plains of Chalmette. I am not optimistic about getting such a bill through. Bitter experience has taught me that a man may come here young and remain until his hair has whitened with the years and yet never accomplish his legislative purposes or hopes, however diligently he work, however tirelessly and assiduously he devote himself to the pursuit of his heart's desire.

Two years ago I came here filled with joy at the thought that I would have the battle field of New Orleans surveyed as a preliminary step looking to the creation of a great military park on the Plains of Chalmette. The bill was favorably reported, but never was reached by the committee on any Calendar



Wednesday when Military Affairs had the call. I had it placed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, but the time was unpropitious, and though I tried on two occasions I could not secure the unanimous consent necessary for its consideration.

I feel that I am now confronted by the dangers of Charybdis and Scylla; though if I pass this point of order and the committee adopt my amendment, the legislative rocks and whirlpool will be left behind. May I succeed, for it is for a noble thing I would do. I would have you consecrate one of the great battle fields of our country. I have hoped and our people have dreamed of the day when the Nation would take the first step in the direction of not only creating a great national military park, commemorative of a glorious martial event in our history, by having a survey made of the field, but also in giving to the people of the United States a perpetual memorial and a shrine to which lovers of American valor, liberty, and freedom might point as one of the hallowed spots on the continent.

There are some events in the history that need no comment; some chapters that require no elaboration. There are some pictures that are unforgettable and teach a lesson more lasting than all the pages on the subject. Washington crossing the Delaware is impressed upon the memory of every American man and woman, because it is the picture that appealed powerfully to the childish imagination of school days.

The Battle of New Orleans needs no poet, no painter, no historian. God said, "Let there be light, and there was light," needs no elaboration. It would be a work of supererogation and destroy the wondrous picture the few words call up instantaneously to the soul of man. More than 106 years have passed away, fled into eternity, since that memorable day, January 8, 1815, when men, guided by the sense of direction, marched from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi to New Orleans. They came over a wilderness without compass or guide; they came in rags, the clothes being almost torn from their backs as a result of marching through the wilderness; they came, they saw, they conquered. Those were the days when the Republic was young. There were no roads, no steamboats, no locomotives, no electric lights to light them on their way at night, only the stars and moon. They came to preserve the mouth of the Mississippi River to the American people.

Whom did these backwoodsmen conquer? Troops that were the pride and glory of the Peninsular Wars, and who afterwards won distinction as the "Invincibles" under Wellington at Waterloo. Whom did they next drive to a disastrous defeat? Those that conquered Napoleon, and generously we say it, the bravest of the brave, gallant Packenham, and the followers who died with him on the day that should be a red-letter day in American history.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is the purpose of your amendment?

Mr. O'CONNOR. To have a survey made of the battle field of New Orleans, on the Plains of Chalmette.

I think, gentlemen, we ought to order this survey. I believe the American people want to keep this event and spot green in the memory of every generation. They do not wish to forget Andrew Jackson's great victory. That was the only land battle of the War of 1812, that redeemed it from an almost unbroken series of calamities, catastrophes, and disasters.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Sharing with my good friend in his appreciation of all that is worthy of admiration and all that was gallant in the Battle of New Orleans, I do not want him to forget the Battle of Plattsburg, which was a decisive battle and broke up the British military organization in New England. It was both a land and a naval battle.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am glad to hear at all times of the victories of my countrymen and rejoice with him on our success at Plattsburg, though I am also glad to know they can look trial, defeat, and vicissitudes in the face dauntlessly and fearlessly. I am glad to say that I rejoice in the glories of Lake Erie, and I was and am glad that the Appropriation Committee inserted in the naval bill an appropriation of \$10,000 to take care of, maintain, and use for educational purposes the *Niagara*, Perry's flagship, which was raised from the bottom of Lake Erie, where it had lain for many years.

The American people should ever keep before them their victorious fields; they should never lose sight of our defeats, with their heartaches. The tender chords of memory stretch out from every battle field inspiring respect, admiration, reverence, and a thrilling pride in the glory of those that are no more; the mystic influence of a noble past stretches out north, south, east, and west to every home and fireside where patriotism is enthroned and boys and girls exultingly read the chap-

ters written in fadeless glory by those who are on fame's eternal camping ground and in the bivouac of the dead.

Gentlemen, I dislike to mention the cost when a great sentimentality is under discussion; it sounds sordid and almost unpatriotic. But, as a matter of fact, there will be no cost. To make a survey of the battle field of New Orleans would require only a negligible sum. The engineers are down at New Orleans, and they could make that survey at a cost, in all probability, not exceeding \$500. Let us make the start. I believe that a provision of this kind eventually is inevitable. Why not start now? The Colonial Dames of America would be gladdened if we were to make a survey, and either the Colonial Dames or the Daughters of the American Revolution or the Daughters of 1812 or some other patriotic society, if not the Government, will take up the matter, and in the years to come we shall have at least a foundation upon which to build the superstructure, if I may use that phraseology in connection with the creation of a national park. I believe that battle field away down there on the banks of the Mississippi near the Gulf of Mexico would be sacred, holy ground to the Nation. I hope to see all the battle fields of the land memorials which will serve a splendid purpose, and that is to keep in the minds of the youth of this country the greatness of the past, the glory of our achievements, and the wonders that may still lie in the future to be wrought by heroic hearts of other generations. I would want, gentlemen, these memorials of battle fields and wonderful institutions and splendid pictures of our country to convey to the minds of our boys and girls the lessons of the past, "Lest we forget; lest we forget." For the past is the lamp of experience, and it is by its rays that we should guide our steps on the road we are traveling to-day.

Mr. Chairman, I have not discussed the Army bill or the Navy bill up to the present time. I know there is an overwhelming demand for economy, and particularly for a reduction of the Army. I wanted to hear from the Members of this House as to what they thought on this all-important matter and ascertain whether our lay knowledge is equal to the information that was tendered to the committee. I have listened, but at no time have I heard a convincing voice raised in defense of a small Army. The constituency I represent stands with the rest of the country for a relief from burdensome taxation, and I am obligated to hear that cry for relief. But, personally, and not as a Representative, if I may express my attitude in those terms, I say, Keep the country in a state of preparedness. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, may I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do not go too far in the reduction of the Army; but build ye a Navy! A nation that flatters itself that it can ignore preparedness is tottering to its destruction and fall. Strip the Army and Navy of the molycoddle elements and secure the red-haired, deep-chested, red-blooded men that one gentleman yesterday said he would like to see our Army and Navy made of. It may sound like a brutal doctrine, but "Kingdoms by blood gained must be by blood maintained." To hold that you can secure greatness by force, through power, and then maintain it by diplomacy is illogical and not in conformity or in line with what history teaches. It is the folly of such an attitude that has brought every fallen nation finally to its knees and sunk it into its grave.

You can not acquire an empire of territory and create wealth so vast as to defy comprehension by the iron hand and then when you have attained the heights of greatness and glory scorn the base degrees by which you did ascend. It is such complacency that invites the attack of the lesser breed without the law and brings ruin and oblivion to the Nation that in its own blind conceit believes it is invulnerable. [Applause.]

Thus runs the scroll of human destiny

Written in fire and blood and scalding tears.

Scrawled with wrecked hopes and blasted visions

The weary record of ten thousand years;

The weary tale of peoples and kings,

The glowing dreams of empire and race

That to the law that ruleth earthly things

In ruin yielded place.

Let us answer the cry of the country for economy, but let us warn our countrymen of the terrible dangers that lie in attempting to reduce the Army below the rock bottom of the Byrnes amendment. Let those who do not desire to remain with the service get out, for the soldier who does not feel the thrill



and the joy of martial service is not a valuable unit of the Army. Let him depart.

On some other day I hope to devote myself to some length on this subject. I regret that the inexorable demand of the hour for strict, rigid economy and a reduction of the Army has been accentuated by the lack of judgment on the part of the solicitors for recruits, who have convinced the American people through posters and otherwise that instead of the Army being a fighting machine it is presently striving to justify its existence as a training school for trades, vocations, avocations, and professions.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us return—or, rather, let me return—to my mutton, to my amendment. I hope the point of order will not be pressed, will be withdrawn, and the amendment adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, most regretfully I am obliged again to consult the rules of the House and make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Most regretfully the Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

**PURCHASE OF ARTICLES MANUFACTURED AT GOVERNMENT ARSENALS.**

No part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that at the time of the proposed acquirement can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government arsenals of the United States for a sum less than it can be purchased or procured otherwise.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out all of line 10 after the words "United States" and all of line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNIGHT: Page 64, line 10, after the words "United States," strike out "for a sum less than it can be purchased or procured otherwise."

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentlemen of the committee and the press may not get their wires crossed on the position that I am assuming in this matter. I am not making war either upon preparedness or upon an adequate Army, but I am making war upon that profit which there is in war. If this amendment should be adopted, it would compel the Government, wherever possible, to expend the money appropriated in this act at Government factories. I offer this amendment in view of two pronouncements that have impressed me more than any others that I have read in a long time. One of them was a speech delivered by Col. Buckner of a great munition plant during the year 1918. In discussing with his salesmen the amount of money made by this gigantic corporation he said that after paying \$2,000,000 to the Red Cross and \$4,000,000 in war stamps and all of the taxes that were then incident to the doing of business the company made the sum of \$129,000,000 that year. I submit, gentlemen, that so long as profit like that is inherent in any business it is not a safe business for any individual to engage in.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNIGHT. I do.

Mr. HULL. Does not the gentleman understand that the very purpose of this entire paragraph is to cut out the profit?

Mr. KNIGHT. It says that you shall not do it unless you can buy it for less; in other words, unless the Government can make it for less, you give it to the private contractor. Read your bill again.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman's idea is to give it to the arsenals in any case?

Mr. KNIGHT. My idea is to give it to the arsenals in any case if they can take care of the business; yes.

Mr. HULL. I would be very much in favor of the gentleman's proposition; but if you can stop the profiteering and force into the arsenals the work that can be done there cheaper you are accomplishing a great deal right now.

Mr. KNIGHT. My amendment would give the work to the Government arsenals provided they could do it at the same figure that the other fellow would do it, but under your bill it specifically says not unless it can be procured for a less sum.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that I secured the passage of this amendment several years ago, and that we placed it on the naval bill, but they are not paying very much attention to it at the present time, either in the Navy Department or in the War Department.

Mr. KNIGHT. They are not paying any attention to anything we do. Congress does not cut any figure whatever.

Mr. HULL. The reason the words the gentleman objects to were put in the bill was to make the provision in order. I

favor the gentleman's idea, but without those words this provision would not be in order.

Mr. KNIGHT. I thank the gentleman. I say that the Army and Navy pay no attention to this House. We legislate here and they proceed to do as they please. I thank the gentleman for that idea, and at some future time I am going to pay my respects to them in no uncertain terms.

The other sentiment that I wish to express is this: The best thing the President of the United States ever said was in his inaugural address, and if you will indulge me briefly, I want to read one paragraph. He said:

I can vision the ideal republic, where every man and woman is called under the flag for assignment to duty for whatever service, military or civic, the individual is better fitted; where we may call to universal service every plant, agency, or facility, all in the sublime sacrifice for country, and not one penny of war profit shall inure to the benefit of private individual, corporation, or combination, but all above the normal shall flow into the defense chest of the Nation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KNIGHT. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman's dream could come true, we should have an Army of 50,000 men, and instead of spending \$330,000,000 in this bill we would probably get by with less than \$30,000,000.

Mr. KNIGHT. I agree with the gentleman, and if I have the time I am going to tell him how it can be brought about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNIGHT. Resuming the reading from the President's inaugural—

There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord with the ideals of representative democracy, when one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive war, while another is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for national preservation.

I agree with that, and I say to the gentleman that when this country goes to real universal conscription and conscripts labor along with the youth of this country, and conscripts wealth along with the fighting forces of this country, and when you shall call to the colors first those between 30 and 50, and when you shall make it impossible that 18,000 new millionaires shall arise out of the hell of war, as have arisen out of this conflict, then I say to you, sir, that the day you mention will have arrived. It is to strike at the profit of war, not at the means of defense, that I offer this amendment; and I say to you, gentlemen, that until this country begins its fight against war all along the line, all the dreams of Hague conventions and international assemblies will be but the vain whisperings of the air, and we will continue to hear voices and to speak language which munition makers can understand. But the day you show to men that they can not profiteer and coin money out of the blood of this country and grow rich and fat and prosperous in the hours of its adversity, I say until that day arrives you will have the conditions that you have to-day, and it is to strike at those conditions rather than in any hope that this amendment will be adopted that I offer it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Was the gentleman in the House when we had the naval bill under consideration?

Mr. KNIGHT. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman heard it stated at that time that they had 75,000 civilians working in the navy yards of the country. Now, would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to compel the Government to keep in the arsenals of our country a very large and perhaps most of the time an unnecessary force of men on the pay rolls? Would not that be the effect of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KNIGHT. No force of men is unnecessary which tends to prevent the hell of war. No expense is unnecessary which would prevent these reapers of tremendous profits going out and lobbying for war. Turn your eyes to the shops and to the great war-munition manufacturers of every country and you will see that 100 per cent of them are shouting for war, while some one else is going to do the fighting, and out of which they are going to reap hundreds of millions of the people's money.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNIGHT. I will.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will not leave his statement in the RECORD uncorrected. Is it not the gentleman's suggestion that the people who manufacture munitions cause Members of this House and of the Upper House to vote for war?

Mr. KNIGHT. I made no such statement; but I say it is inherent in human nature that where one's treasure is there is the heart also.



Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman state one single declaration of war in this country by Members of Congress that has been brought about because of the action of munition manufacturers?

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think that question is absurd on the face of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and also the remarks that I made on the naval appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNIGHT. It means this: The forces that make for war never operate in candor. They wrap the flag around their sacred professions of patriotism and thus clothed in the habiliments of 100 per cent Americanism, Germanism, or Englishism, feed the people propaganda to prepare them for the glorious conflict that is going to pile up millions for themselves. The process is an insidious one. and it would be as well to ask one to segregate the ray of sunshine that helps to make the plains grow as to point to the specific profiteers that cause war or any specific acts that may lead a nation into it. But if anyone doubts that those who reap big profits from war ever fail to work in the interests of their pocketbooks evidence is not lacking that will convince him to the contrary. We need go no further for such proof than an investigation of the Sixty-fifth Congress. The subject was the notorious National Security League. This malodorous organization fairly reeked with perspiring patriotism. It was ready to damn any man to oblivion who dared question its clamor that the Nation should arm and keep armed to the teeth.

It invaded every congressional district in the country, and where the candidate was not ready to follow its slavish behests it put the Indian sign on his door and placarded him as unpatriotic and a danger to his country. Thank God the Congress had the courage to call the turn on these "patriots" and make them understand that this is yet a Government under which no Member of Congress is responsible to anybody except his own constituents. The congressional investigation in its findings utterly damned this organization. I can not refrain from quoting this paragraph from the findings of the committee:

The National Security League and like organizations in their political activities constitute a serious menace to representative government. Ordinarily their real purpose is concealed and their appeal is made to the public on some principle in harmony with dominant sentiment. Usually, as in this instance, they have access to almost unlimited wealth, and borrow respectability, by the use, in honorary positions, of the names of men of national prominence. If their real purpose were apparent, the danger would be relieved.

Men in public life are given by them to understand that they must be subservient to the demands of such institutions; and, upon their failure to do so, they will be held up to public scorn and humiliation by false accusations. Under such circumstances the best-intentioned candidate for office realizes that he has one of two alternatives: He must be either subservient to the demands of these camouflaged organizations or be put on the defensive by false charges. Such activities on the part of organizations similar to the National Security League have a tendency to compel obedience to the wishes of special interests, rather than obedience to a real concern for the welfare of the people. This condition is not at all fanciful, since its baneful effects have been fully demonstrated by the activities of the National Security League.

Now, let us see how this great and superpatriotic organization obtained its funds with which it sought to intimidate and browbeat the people's elected servants. Again I quote another paragraph from the report of the congressional investigation committee:

Among the large subscriptions made to the National Security League is one of \$150,000 made by the Carnegie Corporation, to be paid in three equal installments of \$50,000 each. At the time testimony concerning it was taken, two of the subscriptions, amounting to \$100,000, had been paid; another is that of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, having large interests both here and abroad; another is Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, whose large interests are not confined to this side of the Atlantic.

Among the large contributors to the league are:

Nicholas F. Brady, 54 Wall Street, director in 50 large corporations, many of them making excessive profits on account of the war. Example: Director United States Rubber Co., excess war profits, \$5,494,531	\$4,500
William P. Clyde, 61 Broadway, New York, director in many railroads and other large corporations	1,250
Arthur Curtis James, director in 42 corporations, many of them manufacturing war munitions; vice president and director of Phelps, Dodge Co.—excessive profits over prewar profits, \$14,531,864	29,750
Ridley Watts, 44 Leonard Street, director in many large corporations	15,000
Joseph H. Choate, deceased, 52 Wall Street, formerly ambassador to England; trustee New York Life Insurance Co.	4,750
Mortimer L. and Jacob H. Schiff, 52 William Street, New York, of the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; connection well known. Director in the Wells Fargo Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., and many other railroad and navigation companies	3,250

Emerson McQuillan, 40 Wall Street, director in 14 large corporations	\$4,250
George W. Perkins, 71 Broadway, New York, director in United States Steel Co., International Harvester Co., International Mercantile Marine Co., New York Trust Co., and eight other large corporations, including the Erie Railroad and other railroads	750
H. H. Rogers, 26 Broadway, New York, director in the Standard Oil Co., Amalgamated Copper Co., United Metals Co., and many other large corporations making excessive profits during the war	1,000
W. K. Vanderbilt, Grand Central Terminal, New York, director of 38 large corporations and with his brother director of more railroads than any other capitalist	250
F. W. Vanderbilt, New York, director with his brother in 38 large corporations	750
Clarence H. Mackey, 253 Broadway, director of Postal Telegraph & Cable Co., president of Commercial Cable Co., the North American Telegraph Co., and many other large corporations	1,000
Eversley Childs and William Hamlin Childs, 17 Battery Place, New York, director United States Leather Co., Union Tannery Co., Central Leather Co., Argentine Central Leather Co., and many other large corporations, the Central Leather Co. alone making excessive profits over normal profits of \$12,016,397	7,500
B. M. Baruch, whose former financial connections are well known	6,500
James B. Ford, 1770 Broadway, director in 14 large corporations; director in the United States Rubber Co., whose excessive profits over normal profits were over five and one-half million dollars in a single year. Director in the United States Tire Co. and many war profiteering corporations	1,000
Simon, Murray, and Daniel Guggenheim, 120 Broadway, New York, directors and controllers in American Smelting Securities Co., American Smelting & Refining Co., Chile Copper Co., and many other large corporations making excessive profits from the war. Directors in American Smelting & Refining Co., whose excessive profits over normal profits amounted to \$12,258,082, or more than double	3,750
T. Coleman Dupont, 120 Broadway, in "Who's Who," written by himself, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co., 1902-1905, president of Central Coal & Iron Co., McHenry Coal Co., Union National Bank, National Surety Co., Empire Trust Co., and many other large corporations	9,000
Charles Deering (Chicago, Ill.), director in the International Harvester Co. and many other large corporations	1,550
J. P. Morgan, 23 Wall Street, New York, director in the United States Steel Corporation, whose net profits in 1917 were \$478,204,343 as against \$46,520,467 in 1914; also director of many railroad companies and insurance companies	2,300
American Exporters & Importers' Association, New York	2,000
John D. Rockefeller, 26 Broadway; Mr. Rockefeller's large financial connections are too well known to enumerate	35,000
Carnegie Corporation; Andrew Carnegie, president; Elihu Root, vice president; holdings in United States Steel Corporation; income over \$6,000,000 per year	100,000
Anna B., William H., and Mrs. William H. Bliss	2,500
Henry C. Frick, director of United States Steel Corporation, Chicago & North Western Ry. Co., Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R. R. Co., Mellon National Bank, and many other large corporations	3,500
James Stokcs, multimillionaire and director in a number of large corporations	1,500
Charles Hayden, 25 Broadway, New York, director of 26 large corporations, among them copper companies that made exorbitant war profits; director in Utah Copper Co., prewar profits, \$8,678,491; war profits, \$32,005,240; also director in Chino Copper Co., prewar profits, \$1,772,421; war profits, \$12,527,948	2,500
R. B. Price, United States Rubber Co.	700
J. G. White, 43 Exchange Place, New York; Municipal & General Securities Co., London, England; Cardenas American Sugar Co.; Philippine Ry. Co.	2,000

Observe, if you please, that every one of these contributors was a person or a corporation which immediately would profit by war. In fact, that was exactly why they were willing to give up good money to this glorious patriotic league. They cast their bread upon the waters knowing full well it would return in a few days, or months, in business contracts that would yield anywhere from 200 to 2,000 per cent. Let us look for a moment in another direction.

Of all the most obstreperous advocates of war in Germany, the great industrial works of the Krupps led the procession. So powerful had this great organization become that not only the people but the Government itself was greatly influenced by the opinions emanating from its directors. In France the munition and gun makers had attained an eminence of like nature and to almost a like extent. But why enumerate examples? Since men whetted and sold arms for slaughter they never have proved recreant to the interests of their trade. And it is for this reason that I would take these apostles of war out of a field where they are now a national danger and put them at some useful work. It is bad enough, God knows, for anybody to be compelled to forge the implements of slaughter, but if it must be done let it fall to those who can not be swayed by hopes of inordinate gain into creating conflicts to supply a market. I care not what it costs, it would be infinitely cheaper in the end for the people of this country. Were there no profits in the war games does any one believe that we would now be called upon to vote this enormous sum of almost four hundred millions carried in this bill?

Scan its contents and see how in almost every item lurks great profits for the men who make the material. Scan the naval



appropriation bill with its demands of almost four hundred millions more and ask yourself the question, Would we have appropriated these sums if there had been no profit in armor plate, or ships, or the things that ships use in war? So long as these enormous profits may be made by private persons so long will there continue to grow up a class whose very existence will be, if not a menace to peace, at least a stumbling block in the way of those who would minimize war. Put the profit beyond their reach and their zeal for arming the Nation to the teeth will abate, and I submit this step should be taken by this Government just as soon as it can be done, for such a policy will promote both peace and economy.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio would leave the situation so that the Government would be compelled to manufacture its supplies on a very unsound business basis. All competition from the outside would be removed, and no matter what the cost was we would have to manufacture them in the arsenals. It would lead to gross extravagance.

Mr. LINEBERGER. If the amendment was adopted, would not the Government have to invest millions in building new arsenals?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret very much that we can not have a full and free discussion on this momentous question. There is not a problem that will come before this House so important as the question of munitions making. Article 8 of the League of Nations—and, as far as I am concerned, that was the only good part in the League of Nations—stated very plainly that big armaments, in the first place, were a cause of war and, in the second place, that the way to lessen the probability of war was to turn all munition making over to the Government and then to prescribe rules so that no Government could produce more than a limited amount or sell munitions to any other nation. I regret very much that we can not have in this House a full and free discussion of this question, because I think the House could well afford some of its time to be informed on the subject.

When the Muscle Shoals proposition came before the House I voted with my party, but reluctantly, because even in that case I believed that we should make a beginning by having all plants producing munitions owned by the Government, and there is only one way to start, and that is to make a beginning. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the gentleman's suggestion will lead to a grand apostasy on that question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISH. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio simply says that all munitions shall be made by the Government. I know and you know that the amendment is not going to prevail without any debate; but it is something for you to think about—it is something for you to prepare for—and, remembering the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread, I am willing to make this little prophecy to the Members of the House, and that is that inside of three years Congress will pass an amendment exactly like that presented by the gentleman from Ohio. [Applause.] I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KNIGHT) there were 41 ayes and 56 noes.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers; I want a record on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio demands tellers. Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. ANTHONY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 57 ayes and 72 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch, or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph beginning on line 12 and ending on line 24, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. UNDERHILL: Page 64, beginning on line 12, strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I asked to have the paragraph stricken out in order that I might ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why such a provision should have place in legislation of this character.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman in charge of the bill can give no valid reason why it should be in here. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio who offered an amendment a moment ago, and was in hearty sympathy with all he had to say, but upon reading further in the bill I was constrained to vote against it. The gentleman's remarks were idealistic in urging that all munitions be manufactured in Government plants and all profiteering eliminated in time of war. This is to be desired. But it seems to me that with the experience we have had during the war the provision in the bill which I move to strike out is one of the most iniquitous which could possibly be devised by the mind of man. I can not imagine who in the first place ever thought of such a proposition. I have been a manufacturer; I have been a laboring man, doing hard, manual labor. I never found where business was helped by a proposition of this sort or where labor was harmed because methods of efficiency were introduced in employment.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman says he is a manufacturer?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Not now.

Mr. HULL. Did the gentleman ever use the Taylor system in his manufacture?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Not the Taylor system.

Mr. HULL. I thought so.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I suppose that I ought to be more familiar with the Taylor system; but even if you oppose the Taylor system, whatever that may be, this goes a good deal further. This eliminates any restraint upon loafing, upon slacking, upon inefficiency, and it seems to me it is time now, if it never occurred before, that the Members of Congress ought to take a stand and ought to have the courage of their convictions.

I do not believe that there is a man in this House who at heart is not opposed to this proposition, and I believe that it was placed in the bill because of the so-called labor vote, which does not exist, and which the last election proved does not exist. I do not believe that labor itself wants any such handicap as this. The man who is ambitious, the man who is patriotic, the man who desires to advance in his chosen field of employment, would be glad to see a feature eliminated which places him on the level of the slacker or the man who holds his job by political pull; and I voice my protest against the great Government of the United States yielding to labor organizations, controlled by men who have exploited labor for the last 10 or 15 years and used such efforts as this to retain their power, and I hope that the Members of the House will back up my protest and strike from the bill carrying millions of the people's money something that undoubtedly will cost the people 10, 20, 30, or 40 per cent more than it would if this paragraph were not in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 64, line 16, after the word "watch," strike out the following language: "or other time-measuring device."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that that is a perfecting amendment rather than a substitute.

Mr. BLANTON. Any way the Chair wants to put it, so that I get the floor. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished veteran in the House on this subject, Mr. HULL, of Iowa, whether he intended or not, caused some embarrassment to our new colleague, Mr. UNDERHILL, by asking him something about the Taylor system. If my colleague, Mr. UNDERHILL, had been here for the last few years, he would have fully understood one system if not the Taylor system. He would have known all about the Hull system, by which the navy yards and the arsenals of the United States have been deprived of every means known to the ingenuity of man to require efficiency of our employees. I knew just as well what the answer of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] was going to be before he answered as I did after he answered when the gentleman asked him if he knew any good reason why this provision should be in this bill, and



that honest statesman from Kansas, with his usual good judgment, had to reply that there was not any reason, and there is not any reason. It is in this bill, I will state to my friend, Mr. UNDERHILL, because these men say the Government shall not have surveillance over them and shall not hold stop watches over them, at the same time they put stop watches over every man in the seats on this floor and have had surveillance over them through their agents here in the galleries to such an extent that these things are voted in bills every time Army and Navy legislation comes up. There has not been a single instance when we have not had a chance to vote yea or nay on it; but the vote is always nay when we propose to strike it out. My colleague, Mr. BLACK, has offered this same amendment on the floor that I have offered, and I have offered it before. I can imagine why a man would not want a stop watch held over him, and I am not going to ask to strike the stop-watch provision out of this bill. A man might not want a stop watch held on him. Any laborer in this country, and we are all laborers if we do our duty—the Members of this House are laborers if we do our duty—any man who does efficient service should not object to his employer using some kind of means to see that he gives good, honest, efficient service. Our constituents at home have a way of measuring our efficiency, and if we do not measure up to their standard of efficiency they take us out and put somebody else in our places. Our union friends who insist on this paragraph being placed in each Army and Navy bill, through the ingenuity and persistence and perseverance of our friend, Mr. HULL, have a way of measuring our efficiency in their behalf. They give cards giving us 100 per cent efficiency in their behalf or 90 per cent or 80 per cent and so on down the list. I did not get any per cent at all, I believe, on that subject.

They have a way of measuring us as to the service we render them, and I want to say there is not any excuse why the Congress of the United States should not require the naval employees and the Army employees, civilian employees of this Government, to render efficiency in their work. I called attention here during the consideration of the naval bill, and my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLACK] also called attention some months ago, to what your Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, testified before one of your committees, as shown on page 2672 of the Record for February 5, 1921, from Mr. BLACK's speech, to wit:

When hearings were being held by the Committee on Naval Affairs some members of the committee said to Assistant Secretary Roosevelt and Admiral Parks: "You are not getting the efficiency out of your employees you ought to; why do you not get more efficiency?" Here is what Mr. Roosevelt said in reply to that:

"Last summer my own personal guess—and that is what you might call it—was that we were somewhere between 65 and 70 per cent efficient—that is, we were turning out per day per man 65 or 70 per cent of what we turned out in 1914."

Some member of the committee asked him this question:

"Why do not the officials of the Government make a study of the efficiency of these employees?"

And Mr. Roosevelt's answer is as follows:

"We do not keep time cards, as we are not allowed to do so by Congress."

And yet you vote for this provision every time it comes up in the Army or Navy bill. You have got to answer to your constituents, my friends. They are going to ask you why you did it when you get back home. The people of the United States Government are sitting up now and taking notice more than they have been through the past years, and they are going to hold us responsible for keeping these matters in these bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] does me unusual honor in saying it is my idea and amendment. I was not in the House when this amendment was first put on the Army and Navy bills. That was started in 1913, and I did not become a Member until 1915. So much for that. Most of the information that he gave you was wrong. This amendment was put in the Army bill to stop the efforts of the arsenal commanders or the Chief of Ordnance to introduce into the arsenal what is known as the Taylor system. I do not know whether the gentleman understands the Taylor system or not, but when this bill was before the House last February I read here a letter from a man who is at the present time the president of the American Engineering Society, which originated the Taylor system, absolutely repudiating the system and saying it was understood very well that it was not necessary and that it was disastrous to industry to put it in anywhere. I have asked on the floor of this House—and there are a good many manufacturers here—if there is any man who has heard of the Taylor system being introduced in any manufacturing institution in this country, and so far as I know no one has said they have known of such an institution.

The Taylor system is this kind of a proposition—it is little understood, but some engineers claim that they could go into a factory and by taking certain young men and finding out who was most efficient in doing a certain thing they could find that he can do it in far less time than an older employee, and then they want permission to go to the older employee and remake that man over under a new method of doing the same thing.

There was not anybody who would introduce it into their industries, and they went to the Chief of Ordnance and tried to introduce it into the arsenals of this country. I have no arsenal in my district, but I presume that I have visited arsenals and studied this industrial situation more than most of you. I know, and any man knows, that if you introduce this, what you will get will not be efficiency but inefficiency. I will tell you what it will do. If you will allow the Army officers to do this, every man who comes from West Point will serve his apprenticeship as first lieutenant in the arsenals over men with stop-watches held on them to time their movements as to how they do a certain thing. There is not a Member of this House that would tolerate for a minute a man standing over to say to him, "You are doing this wrong; you will have to start with your left hand instead of your right hand." The effect of it was at once that every efficient employee of the arsenal left there, and you increased the overhead expenses of your arsenals many, many times, because every officer that works in the arsenal is charged up against that arsenal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the gentlemen of the committee that they consider how this section would strike them if it read like this:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer of the Army while making or causing to be made with a stop watch, or other time-measuring device, a time study of the marching of troops.

Would you like it? Would you not think it grossly absurd? Why, time is the vitals and essence of military affairs. The time that troops can march in light marching order, the time it takes them to cover a distance in heavy marching order, the time it takes them to throw up entrenchments, the time it takes to put artillery in place, are the very things knowledge of which is absolutely essential to success in war. The very life of the Nation may depend upon the accuracy of such knowledge. Now, we pay the soldier in war \$30 a month. Is he to be measured, and the man working to supply him with the things that are absolutely necessary for the successful conduct of the soldier's work for the defense of the Nation not to be measured at all? I appreciate the point of view of the employee who does not want a stop watch held over him. I know that such systems have given rise to great abuses. I know that a stop-watch efficiency system—I am not sure it was the Taylor system—has largely broken up the morale in the Post Office Department, where they would time a particular rusher and then, as the gentleman from Iowa has just said, they would try to measure and remake every other man in the office according to that man's standard. Of course, I would not favor any such system as that, and I agree that such a system would not conduce to real efficiency. But this paragraph certainly goes far beyond that when it forbids making, not only by stop watch, but by any other time-measuring device, a time study of any job. What is the job? The job is making munitions of war, things we need with which to defend this country. It may be as essential to our safety to know how much time it takes to make them as to know how much time it will take for Army lorries to take them to the battle line. Is it possible that our officers can be forbidden to make any time study of that kind of a job?

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] ought to carry.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate may be closed in 10 minutes on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. TAGUE. Reserving the right to object, I would like five minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman hold the question for five minutes, and then we will have a better idea?

Mr. ANTHONY. Then 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] told you this matter had been before Congress since 1913. It is true, but it is also true that it has been before the War Department since 1912. At that time the gentleman now occupying the chair over this committee



served on a commission along with ex-Secretary of Labor Wilson and one other Member of the House, to investigate the conditions surrounding the trouble at the Watertown Arsenal, where the employees had rebelled against the use of the so-called Taylor system of scientific management, and this committee rendered a comprehensive report regarding conditions in establishments where the system was employed. It does not make any difference whether it is the Taylor system, the Gantt system, or the Emerson system, or any other system of scientific management, all are founded upon the same principle. A split-second stop watch is held over every movement of every employee, who is driven at top speed, and the minimum time it takes to make a certain article or to do a certain particular piece of work is the time fixed for that job. And that is what you are confronted with in the Watertown Arsenal and other Army and Navy mechanical establishments where other systems were employed in whole or in part.

This provision has no relation to the proposition the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] is trying to inject into it. It relates absolutely to an inhuman system that was in vogue in the Government establishments up to the time this limitation was first adopted in 1914. The system has been tried out by the Bethlehem Steel Co. and other industrial plants in the country, and has generally been discarded as being destructive to the morale of the employees and tends to destroy initiative and efficiency on account of discontent among the workers.

Mr. VAILE. I appreciate the gentleman's argument in regard to that system—

Mr. NOLAN. It is all involved, and you can not separate the stop-watch and bonus and premium systems employed under this so-called system of scientific management.

Mr. VAILE. Do you prohibit any time being set?

Mr. NOLAN. You can not prohibit any time being set. It does not prohibit, but it is for getting a common-sense system of shop management whereby the human element in industry is recognized, at the same time exacting of every employee a good day's work for a good day's pay.

Mr. VAILE. Is not a clock a time-measuring device?

Mr. NOLAN. Yes; and it is being used in every department of the Government in connection with the work of the establishment under common-sense conditions.

Mr. VAILE. And this amendment prohibits its use.

Mr. NOLAN. It absolutely does not. And the Assistant Secretary of the Navy never testified that this provision in the naval bill reduced efficiency 65 per cent, but it was testified to, as everybody knows, that efficiency had dropped during the war, in every line of industry in this country, from a rating of 100 per cent to around 65 per cent, but this was due to the expansion of our shops, and the introduction of inexperienced men who were drawn from nonessential industries into the manufacture of munitions and war materials, and it has not gotten back to normal yet, and will not until conditions get normal, both as to the matter of wages, prices, and everything else, which will include the complete return of the workers to their prewar positions.

Every Congress since 1914, at each session, whenever it had an Army bill or Navy bill before it has carried this provision. Your Army and Navy has not suffered from lack of efficiency. Your industrial and mechanical establishments have not been run down because of this provision. On the other hand, former Secretary of the Navy Daniels repeatedly urged its retention in the Navy bills. This is a humane provision. If any Member of this House wants to know anything about the so-called Taylor system, let him read the hearings that were held before the Committee on Labor during the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses. I guarantee that any man who studies them will come into this House and vote on every occasion for this provision. You can not apply that sort of a system to human beings. You can not time them as you time a race horse or a dog on a coursing park or the athlete on the cinder path, who trains for a particular race or game. You have got to give some consideration to the human element involved in industry. That is what this provision is intended to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The whole speed-up system is a scheme designed to throw men into the discard?

Mr. NOLAN. Exactly. As soon as they are through they are thrown on the industrial scrap heap. This Government can not afford to stand for that sort of system. Gen. Crozier and every man connected with it in the War Department and the arsenals were unable to justify it, and the so-called experts, every one of them, that came before the Committee on Labor fell down. They could not point to a single instance where any consider-

able number of men were employed in industry where the system was not eventually discarded; the principle underlying it is indefensible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he may have two additional minutes out of the time already fixed by the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAN. Now, gentlemen, if you want to find a concrete illustration of where the Taylor system was applied, you will find it in Mr. Taylor's book on Scientific Management, where he tells you how he picked labor in the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s plant, just what he was able to do, how far they were able to apply it, and what a fine set of men he got; and he also tells you in that book about the number of men he put on the scrap heap in the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s establishment. There is nothing in this system that fits a man to a job. There is nothing in this system of scientific management as applied by Taylor, Emerson, and Gantt that tries to fit men into a particular job. If they do not hit the ball and can not follow the pace, they have to go on the scrap heap. Under it men are worth less than machines; they drive both to the breaking point, then they are discarded. This great Government of ours can not stand for that principle. The Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth, and Sixty-sixth Congresses would not stand for that principle. The Sixty-seventh will declare likewise.

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. Yes.

Mr. CLOUSE. Suppose a man perfectly inefficient is put on a job. Does the gentleman contend that he should be put on the pay roll and kept there, regardless of his inefficiency?

Mr. NOLAN. No, I do not. I maintain that a man who can not do a good day's work for a good day's pay ought not to be put on any pay roll.

Mr. CLOUSE. Then, what objection has the gentleman to striking out this paragraph, so that he can be discharged in the event that he can not come up to the standard?

Mr. NOLAN. There is nothing in this paragraph that provides for the keeping of inefficient men on the pay roll. The Army or Navy can discharge their employees at any time for inefficiency or for any other cause that is provided for under civil service, and this provision, either in or out of the bill, has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. CLOUSE. But the gentleman says there is a provision in there that no timepiece can be used.

Mr. NOLAN. Nevertheless, ordinary common sense is the best science of management, and that is what they are following to-day, and you can not find inefficiency in these Government establishments. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, to the older Members of the House who have been here in the past two sessions this is no new question, but to the Members who have just come into the House I want to emphasize the fact that the opposition to this section comes from the same source that it came from on every occasion heretofore. It comes from those who do not know anything about the system, and who have admitted it on the floor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you talk about efficiency, I want to ask, Are you going to measure efficiency by a stop-watch system? There is not a man who has ever had men in his employ in great numbers who has ever applied the stop-watch system without finding out that it not only broke down the efficiency of his men but it also broke down the morale of his men.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says it ought to go into effect. He does not tell you why. He can not tell you why.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Does it break down the morale of the men to pay them a premium or bonus if they do extra good work?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, it breaks down the morale of a man when you put a young man of 25 years of age beside a man of 50 years of age, whose efficiency is marked only by his speed and not by his workmanship.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then is not this an indirect way of insinuating an old-age pension or insurance system into our laws? [Applause.]



Mr. TAGUE. No, Mr. Chairman; it is not. If the gentleman knows the stop-watch system—

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Let me suggest that we have taken steps to establish an old-age pension system in our Government establishments for men who have given to the Government the best days of their lives. Instead of throwing them on the scrap heap we give them a retired pension.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But we give them a pension after they have retired from their work.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the matter of giving pensions to the workmen in the arsenals and navy yards of this country has never been caused by keeping out the speeding system. The best answer to this speed-up system was given during the Great War. We had ships built for the Government in 90 days and in 120 days at enormous expense, and every one of those ships, without a single exception, that was built on the speed system has been brought into the navy yards and shipyards of the country and repaired by the Government at tremendous expense.

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. I regret I can not, although I would like to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, all you have to do is to go into the navy yards and arsenals and find whether there is any inefficiency or not. I have heard a great deal about the inefficiency in the navy yards and arsenals, but the inefficiency is usually measured by the expense of the job. I call the attention of gentlemen to the discussions on the naval bill concerning the condition of the navy yards. The same thing applies to the arsenals. Young men just out of the Naval and Military Academies are brought into the navy yards and arsenals and put over men who have worked as expert mechanics for 20 or 30 years, and those young men who know little about the job attempt to teach the experienced mechanics, and their efficiency under the Taylor system is marked up by a young and inefficient man. The Taylor system, as explained by the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN], has been thrown out of every first-class establishment in the country. There is hardly one using it to-day. But there are some men wearing the uniform who are put over men in arsenals who would like to bring in some system to perpetuate themselves on the job.

Invariably the man who makes the test with the stop-watch system is unable to perform the work himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized for the remaining three minutes.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, the difficulty with those who would like to see this provision stricken out is that they are captivated by the word "efficiency." The object of a time-measuring device is not to stimulate mental activity, is not to help develop the brain in its application to work. Its purpose is to quicken physical movement and to intensify physical effort in connection with a particular operation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Rather is it not to prevent the number of unnecessary movements by showing that you can do the same work with a less number of movements? [Applause.] That is the point.

Mr. LONDON. No; the object everywhere is to multiply the number of physical movements. Every industrial establishment where there is personal contact between employer and employee, and which has attempted to introduce the so-called efficiency system, has been compelled to abandon it because of the disastrous effect upon the health and the morale of the workers. It is only in those cases where a corporation is the employer, and a superintendent who is the slave of the corporation drives other slaves, that this system is being continued. Wherever man deals with man directly in the capacity of employer and employee this system has proven to be a failure.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield for a friendly question?

Mr. LONDON. Pardon me. I have only a minute and a half. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LONDON. The expression "other time-measuring device" refers to a measuring device similar to a stop watch. It does not exclude the usual methods or means for measuring time. It certainly has no reference to a clock. It has no reference to any method by which the time which it takes to produce an article is measured.

On the question of a bonus you have this reservation in the bill. You are not to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant. In other words, the

bonus or reward may be offered for anything that is the result of intellectual activity, for anything that is the product of the human brain. The so-called bonus system mercilessly applied by men who have no interest in human beings and who look upon all men in the factory as mere automata, exhausts the body, stifles all mental effort, and ultimately diminishes production instead of increasing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may that amendment be reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 64, line 16, after the word "watch," strike out the following language: "Or other time-measuring device."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON), there were—ayes 36, noes 69.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERHILL), there were—ayes 36, noes 69.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCE: Page 64, line 24, after the word "plant," insert a new paragraph reading:

"No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be expended for paying to any civilian employee of the United States Government an hourly wage or salary larger than that paid by private employers for corresponding work in the same locality."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition to speak on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the committee all debate has been closed.

Mr. LUCE. On the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. On the paragraph and all amendments thereto, and an additional paragraph is considered as an amendment to the paragraph. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The pay of cadets for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, shall be fixed at \$780 per annum and one ration per day or commutation thereof at the rate of \$1.08 per ration, to be paid from the appropriation for the subsistence of the Army: *Provided*, That the sum of \$250 shall be credited to each cadet who entered the academy since June 15, 1920, and to each such cadet discharged since that date, to the extent of paying any balance due by any such cadet to the academy on account of initial clothing and equipment issued to him: *Provided further*, That hereafter each new cadet shall, upon admission to the United States Military Academy, be credited with the sum of \$250 to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, to be deducted subsequently from his pay.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 66, line 7, after the word "pay," add the following:

"*Provided further*, That hereafter there shall be paid to any candidate for admission to the United States Military Academy, who shall be ordered to report at such Military Academy for mental or physical examination and shall be rejected, the amount of his actual and necessary traveling expenses."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman reserve it for a statement?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will reserve the point.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of calling attention to a condition which I think should be corrected. Under the present system of admitting cadets to the Military and Naval Academies mental examinations are held in various parts of the country, and the cadets are then ordered to report at West Point or Annapolis for physical examination. Many of the young men who aspire to enter the Naval and Military Academies are of limited means. They are required to travel great distances and report at the academies



for examination and frequently for some slight physical defects they are rejected.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is not the gentleman entirely misinformed as to that? I am very sure that in various parts of the United States they conduct the physical as well as the mental examinations.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is what should be done. But I will state to the gentleman that I recently nominated a young man for admission to the Military Academy at West Point. This young man passed the mental examination in California. He was ordered to report at West Point for physical examination, and came all the way across the continent from California for that purpose. I am informed that for some slight defect in his eyesight he was rejected. It cost in the neighborhood of \$600 for him to come east and take that examination. I will say to the gentleman from New York that if the authorities at the academies will conduct these examinations, both mental and physical, somewhere near the residences of the young men, and either accept or reject them there, there will be no need for this amendment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman please, it is done regularly.

Mr. ANTHONY. The Army authorities will take the examination near the home of the applicant.

Mr. BARBOUR. I know it is done in the case of the mental examinations.

Mr. ANTHONY. And also the physical; he will be ordered before the nearest Army surgeon.

Mr. LINEBERGER. If the gentleman will yield, I have a case in my own district. A young man was subjected to a physical examination in his district. He came to Annapolis and was again subjected to another physical examination and eliminated because of a slight defect. However, he finally got in on a third examination. But assuming that he had not been able to obtain the third examination he might have been sent home after the second examination.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is not the physical examination given in the vicinity to the young man merely preliminary, and is he not again required to go to Annapolis or West Point for a further examination? Candidates are rejected for physical defects after arriving at the academies.

Mr. ANTHONY. They have a further physical examination, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the defect will be found in the preliminary examination.

Mr. BARBOUR. If that is so, my amendment would not cost the Government much, because there would be very few young men who would have their expenses paid.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. I have just appointed two young men to West Point and to Annapolis. The instructions were that they should go to some physician of their choosing near their home and take a tentative examination. The physician right there might reveal something that would save them the trouble of going to West Point or Annapolis. I have just had a letter from one young man who seems to be satisfactory in every way except a little question about his feet. The physician is afraid that he may be rejected when he gets to West Point.

Mr. BARBOUR. Does not the gentleman think it would be a whole lot better to have the final physical examination take place somewhere near the young man's home, so that he would know definitely whether he was going to be admitted, and thus save his railroad fare if he is to be rejected?

Mr. LOWREY. I think it would be much better, and that is the reason I am making this statement.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think it was the first day that this bill was under consideration, during the general debate, that I made bold to say that in the future airplane and chemical warfare would figure in a very large way. I did this without knowledge of exactly what preparations had been made for chemical warfare. On yesterday I read a memorandum given by Gen. Fries, of the Chemical Warfare Service, to Gen. Wood on his departure for the Philippines on the probable use of gas from airplanes in the next emergency in which the United States might be engaged.

Mr. Hill, a writer on the New York Herald, has a copyrighted article which appeared in the Herald last Sunday on that subject. The memorandum submitted by Gen. Fries and the article written by Mr. Hill are so much to the point that I desire that they shall be available for Members of Congress, for the General Staff, and for the country. I therefore desire to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting this copyrighted article.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, the question has been raised here before, without reaching any decision, as to whether or not it is proper to insert in the Record a copyrighted article and thus make it frankable. Has the gentleman the permission of the author?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; but I have made inquiry and men in position to know tell me that where the article is copyrighted it is proper to insert it in the Record if due credit is given.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas to extend his remarks as indicated.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would be glad to consent to the gentleman's request for unanimous consent if he will allow me to put some articles in the Record in which I can show that any other arm of the service would put all the rest out of business. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I shall not object to the gentleman putting such articles into the Record.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, if there is going to be a mutual agreement, I have two or three articles I want to put in the Record. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Artillery Detachment, \$118,536.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to the fact that the New York Herald article to which I referred a moment ago, and for which I asked unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record, was inserted in the Record yesterday in another body in connection with a speech made there. As the Record already contains the article, I shall not ask that it be again inserted, and I ask leave to withdraw my request for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to withdraw the article. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, current and ordinary expenses, \$235,475.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the sum of \$235,475.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 80, line 25, strike out the figures "\$235,475."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make this in the nature of a pro forma amendment in order that I may ask the chairman a question. This sum of \$235,475 is made up of various items of appropriation. In the last 8 or 10 pages the expression "and so forth" is used some 50, 60, or 70 times, in connection with appropriations. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be a wise policy, as expressed by various chairmen in the House heretofore, to discontinue the use of this expression "and so forth." It takes in the whole world within the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. ANTHONY. Ordinarily, I think the gentleman's suggestion would be a good one, but the gentleman will notice that the West Point bill is itemized more than any other bill before the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that it is, but we still use the "and so forth."

Mr. ANTHONY. For instance, in this one item of repair it provides:

Repairs and improvements, namely: Timber, plank, boards, joists, wall strips, laths, shingles, slate, tin, sheet lead, zinc, screws, nails, locks, hinges, glass, paints, turpentine, oils, and so forth, \$55,000.

It leaves out the putty.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman knows that notwithstanding the many items specified, they might not spend a single dollar of the appropriation for any of those numerous articles he has mentioned, but could spend the entire appropriation in that paragraph for the "and so forth."

Mr. ANTHONY. But it will have to be for repairs and improvements.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but I wanted to call attention to it in the way of protest. I hope we will stop using this indefinite expression. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the policing of barracks and bathhouses, \$25,000.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 4, page 82, as I desire to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I desire to ask the chairman if the word "policing," in line 4, is used in the ordinary sense of guarding and pro-



protecting against depredations or is used in the technical military sense of keeping clean?

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman is quite correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. McSWAIN. I do not know which way, and I am asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. ANTHONY. It means charwomen and men who clean up and keep the barracks in order.

Mr. McSWAIN. Has the gentleman provided anything for policing barracks in the various military posts?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. Ordinarily that work is done by either enlisted men or by men of the service corps, but at West Point the cleaning-up work is done by charwomen and men employed as laborers for that purpose.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thought it was a part of military training that required men who are being educated at the expense of the Government to learn to keep their own quarters clean. During the emergency of the war when men over the military age, and some of them holding the degree of doctor of philosophy whom I know, many of them with families, volunteered for a very serious national emergency for 90 days' training preparatory to leading our armies in time of war, the valuable time of these men was partially consumed in picking up cigarette butts and match stems.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. My impression is that at West Point the cadets do police their own rooms—that is, keep their quarters in order—but there are a vast number of other buildings there, such as areaways, hallways, schoolrooms, and so forth, and those the cadets are not forced to clean up.

Mr. McSWAIN. Upon the assurance of the chairman, a very fair man, I see, I withdraw my amendment; but I propose to learn more about this institution if the people keep me in the Congress. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War is hereby directed to turn over to the United States Military Academy without expense all such surplus material as may be available and necessary for the construction of temporary buildings; also surplus tools and matériel for use in the instruction of cadets at the academy.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], in charge of this bill, will at the proper time ask for a separate vote on two amendments which have been adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and I desire very briefly to discuss those two amendments, and their effect as I understand them. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] reduced the appropriation for pay of the Army from \$83,000,000 to \$72,678,000. Let us go back a bit in the consideration of this matter. When the military bill for the present fiscal year became a law it provided for funds enough to pay an Army of 175,000 enlisted men. It was the expectation of the Congress that the Army would not be recruited beyond that strength. The Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, believed we should have a much larger establishment than was appropriated for by the Congress, and believing, as he stated, he had the authority to do so under the national defense act, he not only continued to accept recruits but he set up a very expensive recruiting establishment and recruited rapidly on all sorts of liberal and engaging promises. The Congress taking note of this increase beyond the number of men contemplated by the action of the Congress in making the appropriation, the Secretary of War was interrogated by the Committee on Military Affairs on the subject, and that committee expressed as clearly and definitely as it could to the Secretary their dissent, their objection to the policy he was following. The Secretary, however, continued to follow that policy, and finally a resolution was introduced prohibiting the Secretary from enlisting men beyond 175,000. The Secretary, however, continued to enlist men, continued to maintain a great recruiting organization, and to accept enlistments until both the House and the Senate had passed the resolution and until both the House and the Senate had again passed it over the presidential veto. The program of enlistments did not cease until the day the bill was passed over the veto.

In the meantime the Army had been recruited to a strength of over 235,000 men. When the committee came to consider this bill last January there was a general opinion in the House and in the committee that at the very earliest reasonable date we ought to reduce the Regular Establishment to about 150,000 men, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts and the flying cadets.

That was the view of the committee that framed this bill last January; that was the view of the House that passed the bill; and that is, I hope, still the view of the House. It is my view. But it developed after the bill had passed the House that it would not be possible—that it would not be practicable, at least—to reduce the enlisted strength of the Army to a point anywhere near 150,000 men by the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1 next, when this appropriation begins to run. And so in the conference, in order to meet that situation, the appropriation was increased from \$72,000,000 to \$77,000,000, in round numbers, in order that we might provide for the larger force we would have at the beginning of the year and be able to take care of a force gradually decreasing until it reached 150,000 toward the end of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in that form the bill passed and would have become the law, except for the pocket veto of the President. When the committee began the consideration of these questions at the beginning of this session it was discovered there had not been as considerable a reduction of the enlisted strength as had been anticipated, largely, it is believed, because industrial conditions were not such as to tempt men to leave the service prior to the end of their terms of service. At any rate, when the committee began the consideration of this bill soon after the 4th of March, when the present administration took charge of the War Department, they found that the enlisted strength of the Regular Establishment was still about 230,000 men.

It was, of course, necessary to consider this bill in view of that situation, not from a situation as we might wish to have it, but from the viewpoint of the situation as it was.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Very briefly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am one of those who voted for the 150,000 men a few days ago. I did so because the reason did not seem to me sufficient that the Army could not be reduced. May I ask the gentleman from Wyoming if there is any other reason that appeals to the judgment and conscience of Members of Congress for voting for a larger Army than 150,000?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of voting for an Army of 150,000. It is a question of appropriating for the pay of the Army with a view of reducing it to a strength of not more than 150,000 as soon as practicable.

Now, let us be practical. It may be popular somewhere to say, "I would not under any circumstances vote to sustain an army at any time of over 150,000"; but you have an Army of 230,000, and there is no practical way in which you can reduce the Army to 150,000 in the short period between now and the 1st of July. It is a practical question. What are you going to do about it? Are you willing to take action that is likely to lead to a disorganization of the Army, to the reduction of some of the units of the Army to a point where they are not available for useful or active service, or will you follow a course under which we can reach 150,000 at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will it not, as a matter of fact, be the effect of the Byrnes amendment to reduce the Army to 120,000 men and not 150,000?

Mr. MONDELL. There were at last reports nearly 230,000 men. It is not impossible to reduce the Army much below 200,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year to which this bill applies. Therefore if we appropriate for 150,000 men it will be necessary to reduce the Army by the end of the fiscal year to less than 120,000 men in order to pay the larger number we have at the beginning of the year, and still pay for all the men in the Army during the entire year. The Byrnes amendment does not provide for an army of 150,000 men, but for an army of 120,000 men or less at the end of the fiscal year.

I am not so sure but what when we come to prepare the next Army bill we may find—and I hope we shall—that we can reduce the Army somewhat below 150,000 men. But I do not think that anyone has brought forward any argument to prove that it is safe to do that now, or during the time for which these appropriations run.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.



Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wish the gentleman would elaborate a little bit on that proposition, because I am convinced that a number of gentlemen in this House voted for the Byrnes amendment the other day, believing that they were voting to reduce the Army to 150,000, whereas, as a matter of fact, they were reducing it to 120,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Gentlemen here do not want me to diagram this as one would have to do it to a primer class. They are all mathematicians, at least sufficiently versed in mathematics to know that if you begin the fiscal year with 200,000 and have money enough for only 150,000, before the fiscal year closes the number must be reduced down to below 120,000 men. It may be necessary to reduce to 100,000 men if the reduction to 150,000 is not reached early in the year. That is very clear, it seems to me, to anyone who has considered the matter at all.

Now, it may be when we come to appropriate for the next fiscal year we may go below 150,000 men, but at the present time the Congress is not proposing or suggesting that we shall reduce below 150,000 men, and yet this amendment was adopted in committee which would in effect reduce the establishment to less than 120,000 men—a dangerous reduction, in my opinion, just at this time and under present circumstances. I do not think we can afford to do it. The Secretary of War does not believe we can safely do it. No one having knowledge of the establishment believes we can do it without harm to the service. Now, some gentlemen seem to be of the opinion that you can reduce the Army by forcible methods within two or three months from 230,000 men down to 150,000. Anyone who is at all familiar with military establishments knows that is impossible without doing great harm to the service. So this amendment should be voted down and restore the sum which, taking the Army at its strength when this appropriation begins to run, will pay the number of men in the establishment at that time and the gradually reducing force which will bring us down to 150,000 men at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I can not quite understand just what is meant by the gentleman's suggestion that a separate vote be demanded. A separate vote might be demanded—

Mr. MONDELL. On this particular amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. But on the amendment to reduce \$83,000,000 to \$72,000,000? I did not know but what the gentleman's motion would be on the Hull amendment, which was adopted.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] will also ask for a separate vote on the so-called Hull amendment. I am sure the gentleman who offered it had no thought of doing anything that would injuriously affect the service. And yet when we direct the Secretary of War to discharge a man on his application, we do something that puts an end to all discipline in the establishment. Why, a company or a regiment ordered to march on some cold and rainy morning could offer their resignations, and the offer must be accepted if the mandatory provision of this amendment be adhered to. Men under charge of a violation of the Articles of War, as the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] suggested, could demand their release, and under a strict interpretation of that amendment they must be discharged. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I repeat again what I said when this subject matter was last under discussion, that there is no use for us to deceive ourselves and no use for us to be deceived as to what is before us.

Those who favor a large Army will not vote for the Byrnes amendment nor for the Hull amendment. I can see no reason founded in logic why those who favor a reduction of the Army should not vote for both of those amendments. The apprehensions of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] as to the demoralization of the Army by reason of the direction—contained in the Hull amendment—to the Secretary of War to discharge soldiers upon their application until he shall have discharged down to 150,000 are not, in my opinion, well founded, because that amendment provides that it shall be done under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may make. That means, of course, that the Secretary of War would provide rules and regulations under which men could not be dis-

charged when starting on a march or subject to a court-martial for some offense which they may have committed.

The gentleman from Wyoming further states that the adoption of these amendments would cause a reduction of the Army by the end of the fiscal year 1922 to perhaps 120,000. Well, if conditions remain in this country as they are now that does not scare me any. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And if conditions change, this Congress will be in session practically all the time, ready to meet whatever emergency may arise in the Nation. But even that apprehension of the gentleman is not well founded, because the provision of the Hull amendment is that it shall take effect immediately; and so, directly upon the passage of this bill and without waiting for the fiscal year 1922, the Secretary of War, if he discharges his duty under the law, will begin to reduce the Army, so that he can have out of the Army before the beginning of the fiscal year—before July 1, 1921—a very considerable number of these men. So that there is nothing to be apprehended upon that point, in my humble judgment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose that all the really best, experienced men in the Army should be discharged and there were left nothing but the men least qualified; what sort of an embarrassment would the Secretary of War be obliged to meet?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, I do not apprehend that that condition will arise. I do not think that that is a thing that need frighten us here. The proposition confronting us is whether or not we intend to respond, as we can respond intelligently, in my judgment, to what I conceive to be the overwhelming sentiment of this country, that there shall be a reduction in the Army of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if I am in error about that, of course, Congress ought to vote down these amendments. If you favor a reduction of the Army, if you favor getting back toward the small Army basis, there is no danger that I can see in supporting these amendments. Nothing new has arisen here in the last few days since by a decided majority the Committee of the Whole adopted the Byrnes amendment. Nothing new has arisen that I know anything about of a public character since by a very decided vote the Hull amendment was adopted. At both times there was an unusually large number of Members in Committee of the Whole. If anything has occurred to cause a change of sentiment in this House since those votes were taken it has been of a private character and not of a public nature. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TOWNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I only desire, if I can, to try to clear up a little the parliamentary situation. We shall be called upon to vote upon what is known as the Byrnes amendment to reduce, on page 15, the pay of the enlisted men from \$83,000,000 to \$73,000,000. If that amendment is adopted by the House or confirmed by the House, then it will be in order for us either to adopt the Hull amendment or to vote that down, standing upon what is known as the Borah amendment, on page 22, which is contained still as a part of the bill.

Manifestly, it is unnecessary for us to have in operation both the Hull amendment and what is known as the Borah amendment. The Hull amendment, however, was adopted as an amendment. The Borah amendment, as it is called, is already a part of the bill. If the Hull amendment is adopted, then we shall have both the Hull amendment and the Borah amendment.

Now, the difference between those two amendments, in effect and in general, is this: The Hull amendment compels the Secretary to reduce, on the application of soldiers, the number to 150,000 men. Well, if we adopt the Byrnes amendment, that amendment will be in consonance with the Borah amendment; but also the provision on page 22 will be in consonance with the Byrnes amendment, because the provision on page 22 is that the Army shall be reduced to the amount appropriated for it; and if we appropriate for only 150,000 men by adopting the Byrnes amendment, then that will stand. So, then, if the Byrnes amendment is adopted, we have this situation, to choose between the Hull amendment and what is known as the Borah provision.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. TOWNER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Let me just finish this statement, and then I will yield.

I believe that the Borah amendment is the better, for it leaves the reduction to be made by the Secretary of War. Therefore I voted against the Hull amendment. Personally I shall vote for the Byrnes amendment [applause] and I shall vote against the Hull amendment, because with the Byrnes amendment adopted the provision on page 22 allows the Secretary to reduce the number in the Army to the amount appropriated for, or 150,000 enlisted men.

I make these statements so that gentlemen will understand the situation that we are in. We virtually can not get rid of what is known as the Borah provision. It is already in. We shall have no opportunity of voting on it, but we will have an opportunity of voting on the Hull amendment. As to the two provisions, let the committee understand that they first have to determine whether or not they will reduce the Army to 150,000 by reducing the appropriation from \$83,000,000 to \$73,000,000. If the reduction is made then they will have to determine whether they want to adopt either the Hull amendment or the Borah provision, and if the Hull amendment is adopted we will have both provisions in the bill, which certainly is not necessary. It seems clear that the Hull amendment is unnecessary, because of the inclusion of the Borah provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for one minute more. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, how much time can the gentleman afford me?

Mr. ANTHONY. We want to get through the bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall object to any further discussion after five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FISH. I object.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] may proceed for one additional minute of the five?

Mr. BLANTON. One minute or five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. One of the five.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman this question about the Hull amendment: Do I understand by the Hull amendment that the Army can only be reduced by voluntary application for discharge, or can the Secretary reduce it by his own order?

Mr. TOWNER. I understand he is required to reduce it to 150,000 men.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. By voluntary application?

Mr. TOWNER. By voluntary application.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for the four remaining minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations in framing this bill have certainly sought to conform to the ideas of this House in bringing our Military Establishment down to the basis which we felt the House desired. Under the terms of this bill, if enacted, the War Department will be compelled, if it desires to maintain an Army of 168,000 men for which this bill provides, to discharge arbitrarily over 60,000 men between now and July 1, unless that number of men take advantage of the provisions of the bill and ask for their voluntary discharge. The committee felt, and I think it is absolutely correct, as has been stated on this floor, that to compel the further discharge of men in addition to the 60,000 who will be forced out of the Army by July 1 under the provisions of this bill would be an unsafe policy for this House to

adopt. Now, I do not blame the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentlemen on that side of the House for taking advantage of a situation of this kind and of the feeling that exists in the House against a large Army, to endeavor to embarrass the present administration. Personally, I am opposed to a large Army. I am willing at an ordinary time to stand for the Army of 150,000 men that this House desires; but gentlemen on that side of the House forget the fact that while this House was considering the former bill which failed of passage their administration, in spite of the feeling in this House, arbitrarily increased the Army by 35,000 men. You imposed that additional handicap upon the present administration and the present Secretary of War.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. If the gentleman is going to bring politics into the discussion, I am going to make a point of order against discussion out of order. There has been no politics brought into it up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Gentlemen are taking advantage of this situation by trying to force upon the present administration the extremely difficult proposition of bringing the Army down from its present size of 230,000 to 150,000 men within the very short space of one or two months. For that reason, because of the extreme difficulty of reducing a peace-time army, the committee provided for 10,000 more men than there were in the former bill. We did this as an element of safety, so that the Army could be reduced in an orderly and safe manner, and I certainly hope that the House will recognize the difference between the situation which prevailed a few months ago and that which prevails now, and not seek to embarrass the present administration in its already difficult task of bringing the Army down from its present size of 230,000 men to 168,000 men, as provided in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For subdividing rooms 401 and 402, fourth floor, east academic building, including new partitions, new entrances from corridor, new lights, additional slate blackboards, and incidental work, \$1,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to say a few words with reference to my amendment, having in mind what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has said.

Certainly there is no foundation for the statement that in offering my amendment to this bill I was prompted by any desire to take advantage of the disagreement among gentlemen on that side of the House and to cause embarrassment to this administration.

When the bill was reported to the full Committee on Appropriations I then asked why the Army was increased from the 150,000 provided in the last bill to 168,000. No satisfactory answer was given to me then, nor has one yet been offered, and only because that is true did I offer the amendment. Now, is it fair to try and arouse partisan feeling on an amendment of this kind? During the last administration, when this House voted in favor of 175,000 men, the Secretary of War insisted upon recruiting more than 175,000; but gentlemen can not use that as any argument to govern your action at this time, because I reiterate what I have said before, that the Democratic side of this House voted almost unanimously to override the veto of the Democratic President, who vetoed the resolution providing for 175,000 men. Again, when the bill went to the Senate nearly every Democratic Senator voted to override the veto of the Democratic President. No man is justified in endeavoring to arouse partisan feeling in this matter. The question is simply whether since February 3 anything has occurred to justify increasing the Army 18,000 men. On February 3 the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], in discussing this matter, said:

The committee have made an appropriation for the pay of the enlisted men of the Army calculated on 150,000 men during the next fiscal year. The committee believe it will be entirely practicable to reduce the Army to that size, and the committee furthermore believe that that will be one of the policies of those who will be responsible for the Government after March 4.

I also believe that the amount appropriated will be adequate to take care of the pay of such an enlisted force without any deficiency.

Then the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said:

A year ago, just out of the war, still within the war shadows, still under the influence of war conditions, we believed we needed 175,000 enlisted men besides the Philippine Scouts and flying cadets. Most of us now believe, and the country believes, that 150,000 enlisted men will be sufficient. We are appropriating for that number. We are trying, partly at least, to realize the hope and expectation of the American people that we shall get back to normal as soon as possible; that we reduce, so far as we can without injury to our Military Establishment, the enormous total of military costs.



Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am sorry I can not yield. That was on February 3. On March 3 we passed the conference report providing for 158,000 men. This administration, just as was the case with the previous administration, has done nothing to reduce the Army. Under the Hull amendment they will be directed to reduce it to 150,000 men. It is folly to say that the bill provides for only 120,000 men, because when you say that you assume that the Secretary of War will not carry out the direction of the Congress. Now, the fact is that your Secretary of War is not to blame, and we know it. Nobody but the General Staff is to blame; nobody but the General Staff suggested the alternative proposition submitted by the Secretary providing for 182,000 men for the next fiscal year. If we are going to get back to normal, I appeal to you now to stand by 150,000 men, which the gentleman from Kansas said was adequate, and a reduction which the gentleman said was entirely practicable.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, having started this debate I do not want to seem ungracious in suggesting that we have had a liberal debate on the subject, pretty well divided on the two sides, and I doubt if anything new can be presented. All discussion is out of order as it is now proceeding.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no motion and the gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Wyoming last February argued for 150,000 men he did so because there would be then time to reduce the force to that number before the 1st of July. But what happened? The Secretary of War continued to enlist until the Army reached 235,000, and to-day there are 230,000 men in the Army. When this bill becomes a law it will probably be the 1st of June at the very earliest. Then you have 30 days in which the Secretary will be required to reduce the Army from 230,000 to 150,000, if the Byrnes amendment be adopted. That will be an impossibility, and if by chance he is not able to do it by the 1st of July there will be some period during the fiscal year of 1922 when we will be compelled to reduce the Army to 120,000 men.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. What hinders the Secretary of War from beginning to-day?

Mr. MADDEN. Because he has no authority.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the Byrnes amendment make any mention of time in which these men are to be discharged?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the Hull amendment make any mention of time?

Mr. MADDEN. The Hull amendment makes no mention of time. The gentleman must realize that the fiscal year of 1921 ends on the 30th of June, this year. He must also realize that the Army must be reduced from 230,000 to 150,000 by June 30, which means the discharge of 80,000 men, and the gentleman must know that if that thing happens there will be discord and embarrassment in the conduct of the Military Establishment. I believe that we can afford to comply with the wish of the Secretary of War, who suggested a place where we could save \$22,000,000 if we would but give him the \$22,000,000 to add to the personnel of the Army. What did the Committee on Appropriations do? They took the \$22,000,000, suggested as a possible saving at the instance of the Secretary of War, and added 10,000 men to the Army at a cost of six and one-half million dollars, and they come to the House with the recommendation of that saving over the last bill of fifteen and a half million dollars. So the bill before us is fifteen and one-half million dollars less than the bill passed last February, but the bill that was passed last February was vetoed by the President of the United States, then a Democrat, because it did not contain a sufficiently large Army. The conditions of the country are such that I believe there is need to-day for every man provided for in this bill, and I believe we will make a great mistake if we do not vote down the Byrnes amendment and also the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on this paragraph has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extension of water, sewer, gas, and electric systems to new bachelor building, to be immediately available, \$20,000.

Provided, That the constructing quartermaster, United States Military Academy, is hereby exempted from all laws and regulations relative to granting leaves of absence to employees with pay while employed on construction work at the Military Academy.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, let us mean what we say and say what we mean. [Applause.] Those men in this House who voted for 150,000 men the other day knew what they were doing then, and they know what they are going to do in a few minutes. [Applause.] They know what they are voting for and what this amendment will do when it passes this House. There seems to be a great deal of alarm in case the amendment prevails that the Army will be reduced below 150,000 men; suppose it is, suppose it goes down to 130,000. All the time while we have been debating in the last three months the National Guard has been going up; it has already increased 10,000. Besides, if the amendment prevails for 150,000 men in this House, it does not mean that it is going to prevail in the other legislative body. We know the conditions on the other side, we know that the Senate is going to increase the number, and that a conference committee will be appointed. It is fair to assume that this House will then agree to a somewhat larger Army and probably will insist on the previous conference report of 158,000. All this argument about reducing the Army to 120,000 is not built on any foundation of fact.

I listened in this House as a new Member a few months ago to the very convincing argument by the majority leader, the able gentleman from Wyoming, and to the convincing argument of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I followed their counsel and advice and voted for 150,000 men at the last session. They have not produced one single argument or reason that would cause Members of the House to change their minds. [Applause.]

I have the utmost respect for the distinguished Secretary of War, Mr. Weeks, a very able appointment, but we know and the history of this country substantiates that every Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy presents estimates much larger than they expect to get. The General Staff tells you that if you reduce the Army by one you are going to wreck the United States Army, but that is an old story, and the Members of the House are accustomed to that argument. Furthermore, in the last war 4,000,000 men were discharged from the Army when they set about doing it. I submit that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is in order and will not in any way affect the morale of the Army. It simply means that these men who wish to apply for honorable discharge may do so subject to the regulations of the Republican Secretary of War. We Republicans who are going to vote for this amendment are doing so because we believe it is consistent with adequate national defense and public economy. [Applause.] We believe that we should vote for it now and not many years from now.

A scientist once came up my way and told us that "in 18,000,000 years you will not have any trees up here, you will not have any vegetation, nor anything which man raises that you can subsist on, and the human race will disappear from the earth." An old man sitting some distance back said, "How many years did you say?" "Eighteen million years," said the scientist. "Oh," said the old man, "I thought you said 8,000,000 years." [Laughter.] Now is the time to reduce the size of the Army and cut down the appropriations and not 18,000,000 years from now. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Military Academy, \$2,357,250.80.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. No part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for paying any civilian employee of the United States Government an hourly wage or salary larger than that customarily paid by private individuals for corresponding work in the same locality."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the committee has already acted on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that the committee has already acted on this amendment. The Chair will compare the two.

Mr. LUCE. May I call the attention of the Chair to the changes which have been made?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I make the further point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds it is not the same.



Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order it is new legislation, and the further point that it is not germane to this part of the bill.

Mr. WINGO. This very amendment is one customarily offered. It is a limitation; it is very clear on its face.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been a ruling and I wish to direct the attention of the Chair to the ruling made by former Vice President Sherman, when he was acting as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on an appropriation bill, and I believe it is confirmed by other decisions, that if there is any place in the bill where an amendment is in order a Member can not offer it in a different place; otherwise, instead of expediting legislation, you will be impeding and hindering it. When the gentleman from Massachusetts offered an amendment of a similar nature and the committee voted it down, that was the place it would have been germane to the paragraph or provisions then under consideration. If the Chair is going to rule and claim that after an amendment has been rejected by the committee at a subsequent stage of proceedings any Member can offer an amendment almost identical and have it considered, and so on ad infinitum, I say there will be no progress in legislative consideration but delay continuously.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, when an amendment somewhat resembling this was presented at an earlier stage I was in very grave doubt whether the point of order would not have laid against it then as not being pertinent to the paragraph it followed. In my judgment a better case can be made out for its presentation at this stage, because it refers to nearly everything, or at least to a great deal, that is scattered through the bill. It is a blanket limitation of expenditure, which may properly be affixed at the end of a bill in the same way that frequently a section is added saying when the bill shall take effect. The gentleman would hardly contend that there might not be affixed here a section prescribing that the bill shall take effect at a specified day. I conceive of no more pertinent and appropriate place to make a limitation apply to all the paragraphs of a bill than at its conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It can not be too often stated in connection with rulings of the Chair that it is not the province of the Chair to pass upon the wisdom or lack of wisdom of an amendment. Only the form as it relates to parliamentary proceedings is material here. It seems to the Chair that this is purely a limitation, and that it limits all the appropriations carried in this bill. As stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, if it is properly a limitation, it seems to the Chair that there could be no better place than at the close of the bill, since it is applicable to the entire bill. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HERRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment of the gentleman an amendment to the one now pending?

Mr. HERRICK. It is one I have offered, but the Chair recognized the other gentleman's amendment first. My amendment was on a different subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I well realize the committee is very properly anxious to pass judgment upon the vital issue which has just been laid before us, but if in a few minutes it is possible to save to the taxpayers of the Nation several hundred thousand dollars it may be worth while even to delay action upon the more important matter until this amendment can be explained. One of the evils brought by the war was competition between the Government and private employers, the Government paying higher wages and offering shorter hours in order to get men and women away from their customary occupations. No exception could then be taken, for the war demands were imperative and paramount. It was, to be sure, a great hardship even to those engaged in the manufacture of munitions, and the competing of the Government and employers against each other undoubtedly caused a great rise in the cost of living. Since the war there is no longer any justification for this practice, but I regret to say it continues, and in various parts of the country civilian employees of the Government are paid higher wages than are customarily paid in the locality.

I understand in the arsenals, and possibly in the navy yards, there are boards of adjustment which carry into effect precisely the proposal here. The justice of the principle therein applied we all recognize. This provision intends that the same principle should be applied throughout the expenditure of all the money herein appropriated. To illustrate, I received yesterday a letter from a constituent, in which he spoke of a young woman who had come to him saying that she had been receiving \$25 a week from the Government for an hour and a half less

work a day than she had previously done for \$15 a week. My constituent was willing to pay \$18 a week. He finds himself unable to compete under those circumstances with officers of the Army who are disposed to pay high prices, who are apparently without restriction, and who take away from private employers skilled employees by offering unreasonable wages. This is no criticism upon labor nor an attack upon the wages customarily received, but a suggestion that if the committee desires to help along in the return of the wage scale and the cost of living to a reasonable figure it can do no better than begin with its own affairs. I do not ask that less be paid than is paid in the neighborhood. I ask simply that the ordinary, customary rate of wages paid by private employers in the locality shall be the standard for Government payment in the expenditure of all this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again read?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again read. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 120, noes 26.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HERRICK] has an amendment at the desk.

Mr. HERRICK. I ask that it be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, after line 14, insert:

"That for the carrying out of the provisions of this act and the reduction of expense, the state of war that has existed between the United States and the Imperial German Government and the allied Central Powers since April 6, 1917, is hereby declared to be at an end, and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to withdraw all the United States soldiers now in Germany as speedily as the same can be done consistent with the interests and rights of the United States."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5010, the Army appropriation bill, and had instructed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on what is known as the Byrnes amendment, on page 15, line 2, and on what is known as the Hull amendment, page 16, line 10.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the other amendments should be voted on en grosse.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask for a separate vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment, adopted on page 33, striking out the provision authorizing the transfer of automobile trucks to the Agricultural Department for road construction in the States.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Page 15, line 2, strike out the figures "\$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$72,678,659."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.



The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 133, noes 120.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 193, nays 158, answered "present" 2, not voting 77, as follows:

## YEAS—193.

Almon	Driver	Lankford	Riordan
Andrews	Echols	Larsen, Ga.	Robison
Arentz	Fairchild	Larson, Minn.	Rose
Aswell	Farrot	Lawrence	Rouse
Bankhead	Fish	Layton	Rucker
Barbour	Fisher	Lazaro	Sanders, Tex.
Barkley	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Sandlin
Beck	Flood	Linthicum	Schall
Bell	Focht	Little	Scott, Tenn.
Benham	Frear	Logan	Sears
Black	Freeman	London	Sinclair
Bland, Va.	Fulmer	Lowrey	Smithwick
Blanton	Garner	Luce	Speaks
Boies	Garrett, Tenn.	Lyon	Stafford
Bowling	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Stegall
Box	Gensman	McDuffie	Stedman
Brand	Gerner	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stevenson
Briggs	Goldsbrough	McSwain	Strong, Kans.
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	MacGregor	Summers, Wash.
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Summers, Tex.
Brown, Tenn.	Griffin	Mason	Swank
Buchanan	Hammer	Mead	Sweet
Bulwinkle	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ohio	Swing
Burtess	Hawes	Moore, Va.	Tague
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Morgan	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Herrick	Murphy	Taylor, Tenn.
Campbell, Kans.	Hoch	Nelson, A. P.	Ten Eyck
Cantrill	Huddleston	Nelson, J. M.	Thompson
Carew	Hudspeth	O'Connor	Tillman
Carter	Hull	Ogden	Tincher
Chalmers	James, Va.	Oldfield	Towner
Christopherson	Jeffers	Oliver	Tyson
Clague	Johnson, Ky.	Overstreet	Underhill
Clouse	Johnson, Miss.	Padgett	Vinson
Collier	Jones, Pa.	Parks, Ark.	Voigt
Collins	Jones, Tex.	Parrish	Ward, N. C.
Connally, Tex.	Keller	Perkins	Weaver
Connell	Kelly, Pa.	Perlman	White, Kans.
Cooper, Wis.	Kendall	Pou	Williams
Coughlin	Ketcham	Quin	Williamson
Crisp	Kinchelec	Rainey, Ill.	Wilson
Cullen	Kinkaid	Raker	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Klecza	Ramseyer	Woods, Va.
Deal	Knight	Rankin	Woodyard
Dominick	Kopp	Rayburn	Wright
Doughton	Kraus	Reavis	Young
Dowell	Kunz	Reeco	
Drane	Lampert	Rhodes	
Drewry	Lanham	Ricketts	

## NAYS—158.

Ackerman	Fenn	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Anthony	Fess	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Appleby	Fordney	McLaughlin, Mich.	Scott, Mich.
Atkeson	Free	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shaw
Bacharach	French	Madden	Shelton
Beedy	Frothingham	Magee	Shreve
Bixler	Gahn	Maloney	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Glynn	Mapes	Sinnott
Bond	Good	Merritt	Siemp
Brennan	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Smith
Burdick	Greene, Mass.	Michener	Snell
Burroughs	Greene, Vt.	Miller	Sprui
Burton	Griest	Mills	Steenerson
Butler	Hadley	Millsbaugh	Stephens
Cable	Hardy, Colo.	Mondell	Taylor, N. J.
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	Montoya	Temple
Cannon	Hickey	Moore, Ind.	Tilson
Chandler, Okla.	Hicks	Mott	Timberlake
Chindblom	Hill	Mudd	Tinkham
Classon	Himes	Newton, Minn.	Treadway
Codd	Hogan	Nolan	Vaile
Colton	Houghton	Norton	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Hutchinson	Opp	Vestal
Crowther	Ireland	Osborne	Volk
Curry	James, Mich.	Paige	Volstead
Dale	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, N. Y.	Walsh
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Patterson, Mo.	Walters
Darrow	Kearns	Patterson, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Dempsey	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	Watson
Denison	King	Petersen	Webster
Dickinson	Kirkpatrick	Porter	White, Me.
Dunbar	Kissel	Pringey	Winslow
Dupre	Kline, N. Y.	Purnell	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kline, Pa.	Ransley	Woodruff
Elliott	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Wurzbach
Ellis	Leatherwood	Riddick	Wyant
Elston	Laneberger	Roach	
Evans	Longworth	Robertson	
Fairfield	Lahring	Rodenberg	
Faust	McArthur	Rogers	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Harrison Humphreys

## NOT VOTING—77.

Anderson	Browne, Wis.	Copley	Funk
Ansorge	Burke	Cramton	Gallivan
Begg	Chandler, N. Y.	Davis, Minn.	Gilbert
Bird	Clark, Fla.	Dunn	Gorman
Blakeney	Clarke, N. Y.	Edmonds	Gould
Bowers	Cockran	Fields	Graham, Pa.
Bricson	Cole	Foster	Haugen
Britten	Cooper, Ohio	Fuller	Hays

Hersey	Lee, N. Y.	Park, Ga.	Stiness
Hukriede	Leibach	Parker, N. J.	Stoll
Husted	Lufkin	Radcliffe	Strong, Pa.
Jacoway	McCormick	Rainey, Ala.	Sullivan
Kahn	McPherson	Reber	Thomas
Kennedy	Mann	Reed, W. Va.	Upshaw
Kiess	Mansfield	Rosenbloom	Wheeler
Kindred	Montague	Rossdale	Wise
Kitchin	Moore, Ill.	Ryan	Zihlman
Kreider	Morin	Sabath	
Langley	Newton, Mo.	Sisson	
Lea, Calif.	O'Brien	Snyder	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. BEGG (for) with Mr. CRAMTON (against).  
Mr. GALLIVAN (for) with Mr. LUFKIN (against).  
Mr. MONTAGUE (for) with Mr. HARRISON (against).  
Mr. FOSTER (for) with Mr. LEE of New York (against).  
Mr. MANSFIELD (for) with Mr. HUKRIEDE (against).  
Mr. ANSORGE (for) with Mr. RADCLIFFE (against).  
Mr. STOLL (for) with Mr. LEHLBACH (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. UPSHAW.  
Mr. BURKE with Mr. FIELDS.  
Mr. MANN with Mr. KITCHIN.  
Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. WISE.  
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. SULLIVAN.  
Mr. FUNK with Mr. PARK of Georgia.  
Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. COCKRAN.  
Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. THOMAS.  
Mr. REBER with Mr. JACOWAY.  
Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. SISSON.  
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.  
Mr. BLAKENEY with Mr. LEA of California.  
Mr. DUNN with Mr. SABATH.  
Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'BRIEN.  
Mr. MORIN with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.  
Mr. BIRD with Mr. KINDRED.  
Mr. KREIDER with Mr. GILBERT.  
Mr. KIESS with Mr. BRINSON.  
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. HUMPHREYS.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present in the Hall when his name was called?

Mr. HAYS. No.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during the roll call, but I wish to vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: Page 16, line 10, after the word "is" strike out the words "authorized in his discretion," and insert "directed under such reasonable regulations as he may prescribe": in line 12, after the word "men," insert "serving in continental United States"; in line 13, after the word "discharges," insert the words "until the number in the Army has been reduced to 150,000 enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts," so that the amendment will read, "and the Secretary of War is directed under such reasonable regulations as he may prescribe to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men serving in continental United States without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges until the Army has been reduced to 150,000 men, not including the Philippine Scouts."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 147, noes 138.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment will, when their names are called, vote "yea"; those opposed will vote "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 170, not voting 76, as follows:

## YEAS—184.

Almon	Boies	Cantrill	Davis, Tenn.
Andrews	Bowling	Carew	Deal
Arentz	Box	Carter	Dominick
Aswell	Brand	Chalmers	Doughton
Bankhead	Briggs	Christopherson	Dowell
Barkley	Brooks, Ill.	Clague	Drane
Beck	Brown, Tenn.	Clouse	Drewry
Beedy	Buchanan	Collier	Driver
Bell	Bulwinkle	Collins	Farrot
Benham	Burtess	Cooper, Wis.	Fish
Black	Byrnes, S. C.	Crisp	Fisher
Bland, Va.	Byrnes, Tenn.	Cullen	Fitzgerald
Blanton	Cable	Curry	Flood



Focht	Kopp	Overstreet	Steagall
Frear	Kunz	Padgett	Stedman
Freeman	Lampert	Park, Ga.	Steenerson
Fulmer	Lanham	Parks, Ark.	Stevenson
Gahn	Lankford	Parrish	Strong, Kans.
Garner	Larsen, Ga.	Perkins	Summers, Wash.
Garrett, Tenn.	Larson, Minn.	Perlman	Summers, Tex.
Garrett, Tex.	Layton	Pou	Swank
Glynn	Lazaro	Quin	Sweet
Goldsborough	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, Ill.	Swing
Green, Iowa	Linthicum	Raker	Tague
Griffin	Little	Ramseyer	Taylor, Colo.
Hammer	Logan	Rankin	Taylor, Tenn.
Hardy, Tex.	London	Rayburn	Ten Eyck
Harrison	Lowrey	Reavis	Thompson
Haugen	Lyon	Reece	Tillman
Hawes	McClintic	Rhodes	Tyson
Hayden	McDuffie	Ricketts	Vinson
Herrick	McSwain	Riordan	Voigt
Huddleston	Mansfield	Robison	Volk
Hudspeth	Martin	Rodenberg	Volstead
Hull	Mason	Rose	Ward, N. C.
James, Va.	Mead	Rouse	Weaver
Johnson, Miss.	Michener	Rucker	Wheeler
Jones, Tex.	Moore, Ohio	Sanders, Tex.	White, Kans.
Keller	Moore, Va.	Sandlin	Williams
Kelly, Pa.	Morgan	Schall	Williamson
Kendall	Murphy	Scott, Tenn.	Wilson
Ketcham	Nelson, A. P.	Sears	Wingo
Kincheloe	Nelson, J. M.	Sinclair	Woods, Va.
Kinkaid	O'Connor	Smithwick	Woodyard
Klecza	Oldfield	Speaks	Wright
Knight	Oliver	Stafford	Young

## NAYS—170.

Ackerman	Fordney	Lineberger	Roach
Anthony	Free	Longworth	Robertson
Appleby	French	Luce	Rogers
Atkeson	Frothingham	Luhning	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Gensman	McArthur	Sanders, N. Y.
Barbour	Gerner	McFadden	Scott, Mich.
Bixler	Good	McKenzie	Shaw
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shelton
Bond	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shreve
Brennan	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	MacGregor	Sinnott
Burdick	Griest	Madden	Slemp
Burroughs	Hadley	Magee	Smith
Burton	Hardy, Colo.	Maloney	Snell
Butler	Hawley	Mapes	Sprout
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Merritt	Stephens
Campbell, Pa.	Hickey	Michaelson	Taylor, N. J.
Cannon	Hicks	Miller	Tilson
Chandler, Okla.	Hill	Mills	Timberlake
Chindblom	Himes	Millsbaugh	Tincher
Classon	Hoch	Mondell	Tinkham
Connell	Hogan	Montoya	Towner
Colton	Houghton	Moore, Ind.	Treadway
Connolly, Pa.	Humphreys	Mott	Underhill
Coughlin	Hutchinson	Mudd	Vaile
Crowther	Ireland	Newton, Minn.	Vare
Dale	James, Mich.	Nolan	Vestal
Dallinger	Jeffers	Norton	Walsh
Darrow	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ogden	Walters
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Olp	Ward, N. Y.
Emison	Jones, Pa.	Osborne	Wason
Jackinson	Kearns	Paige	Watson
Dunbar	Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. Y.	Webster
Dupré	King	Patterson, Mo.	White, Me.
Dyer	Kirkpatrick	Patterson, N. J.	Winslow
Echols	Kissel	Peters	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Kline, N. Y.	Petersen	Woodruff
Ellis	Kline, Pa.	Porter	Wurzbach
Elston	Knutson	Pringley	Wyant
Evans	Kraus	Purnell	Yates
Fairfield	Langley	Ransley	Zihlman
Faust	Lawrence	Reed, N. Y.	
Fenn	Leatherwood	Riddick	

## NOT VOTING—76.

Anderson	Cramton	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. J.
Ansorge	Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Radcliffe
Begg	Dunn	Kennedy	Rainey, Ala.
Bird	Edmonds	Kies	Reber
Blakeney	Fairchild	Kindred	Reed, W. Va.
Bowers	Fess	Kitchin	Rosenbloom
Brinson	Fields	Kreider	Rossdale
Britten	Foster	Lea, Calif.	Ryan
Browne, Wis.	Fuller	Lee, N. Y.	Sabath
Burke	Funk	Leibach	Sisson
Chandler, N. Y.	Gallivan	Lufkin	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Gilbert	McCormick	Stiness
Clarke, N. Y.	Gorman	McPherson	Stoll
Cockran	Gould	Mann	Strong, Pa.
Codd	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Sullivan
Cole	Hersey	Moore, Ill.	Temple
Connally, Tex.	Hukriede	Morin	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Husted	Newton, Mo.	Upshaw
Copley	Jacoway	O'Brien	Wise

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FESS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. HUKRIEDE with Mr. STOLL.

Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. CONNALLY of Texas.

Mr. BEGG with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, was called away from the Chamber on account of the illness of his daughter. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea" on the previous vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 13, after the word "sell," strike out the remainder of the line and lines 14, 15, and 16 down to and including the word "sale," being the following language: "or to dispose of by transfer to the Department of Agriculture under existing laws, for its own use and the use of the several States in road work and maintenance of roads, not less than one-half by sale."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. No part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be used for paying to any civilian employee of the United States Government an hourly wage or salary larger than that customarily paid by private individuals for corresponding work in the same locality."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 213, noes 33.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eleven Members rising, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The amendment is agreed to. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion to recommit. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment, to wit: On page 64, in line 16, after the word "watch," strike out the following language, to wit, "or other time-measuring device."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 6, noes 220.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill. All those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-one Members, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask for a division.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been refused.

Mr. BLANTON. On the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. They have just been refused on the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Alabama demands a division. The House divided; and there were—ayes 241, noes 23.

Accordingly the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ANTHONY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow, and I do that for the purpose of submitting a further request for unanimous consent that we take up for consideration to-morrow under the general rules of the House H. R. 5676, a bill taxing contracts for the sale of grain for future delivery.

Mr. Speaker, this bill might be taken up to-morrow on the Calendar Wednesday call, but the committee are anxious to have rather more latitude in the general debate than would be had on Calendar Wednesday and desire that the consideration of the bill may be in order until it is concluded. Hence my request. Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand this bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL. It is.



Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So then we will go into Committee of the Whole for general debate on the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming to dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an Executive order on post offices.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to ask unanimous consent to consider the bill which he indicated?

Mr. MONDELL. I thought the two requests were agreed to. If not, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow we take up for consideration under the general rules of the House H. R. 5676.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to be taken up for consideration to-morrow under the general rules of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### POSTMASTERS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Executive order I referred to a moment ago and a brief statement accompanying it be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the paper referred to may be read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER.

When a vacancy exists or hereafter occurs in the position of postmaster at an office of the first, second, or third class, if such vacancy is not filled by nomination of some person within the competitive classified civil service who has the required qualifications, then the Postmaster General shall certify the fact to the Civil Service Commission, which shall forthwith hold an open competitive examination to test the fitness of applicants to fill such vacancy, and when such examination has been held and the papers in connection therewith have been rated, the said commission shall certify the results thereof to the Postmaster General, who shall submit to the President the name of one of the highest three qualified eligibles for appointment to fill such vacancy unless it is established that the character or residence of any such applicant disqualifies him for appointment: *Provided*, That at the expiration of the term of any person appointed to such position through examination before the Civil Service Commission, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, submit the name of such person to the President for renomination without further examination.

No person who has passed his sixty-fifth birthday, or who has not actually resided within the delivery of such office for two years next preceding such vacancy, shall be given the examination herein provided for.

If, under this order, it is desired to make nomination for any office of a person in the competitive classified service, such person must first be found by the Civil Service Commission to meet the minimum requirements for the office.

May 10, 1921.

#### STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT ISSUED TO-DAY.

There are more than 400,000 men and women participating in governmental work who are in classified service. All of these are under the permanent provisions of the civil-service law and rules.

These permanent rules provide for the certification of the highest three eligibles, and from the list of three each necessary appointment is made. The successful operation of the principles of civil-service law has demonstrated the wisdom of this provision. This leaves in the appointing power, who has the ultimate responsibility for efficient administration, the necessary, constitutional right of choice. This right of selection is the kind of responsibility which can not legally be and is not abridged by act of Congress and is in exact harmony with the spirit of the civil-service principle.

There are 52,332 postmasters. Of these, 39,433 are in the fourth class and are now under such civil-service laws and regulations as bring them within the privileges and conditions of the classified service.

Of the remaining 12,899 post offices, 700 are first class, 2,617 are second class, and 9,582 are third class. Obviously these offices are business agencies of the Government in legal purpose and should become so in fact. The only certain ultimate way to bring this about is to classify first, second, and third class postmasters. This will require an act of Congress. It is a step forward, measured by the requirements of progress, and is one which I hope will be made. Under existing laws the Executive has no power to require that these offices be placed in the classified service.

Moving in that direction, however, the Executive order issued to-day provides that if any such vacancy is not filled by nomination for promotion of one from within the competitive classified civil service, then an open competitive examination shall be held and the appointment shall be made from one of the highest three eligibles, as required now by law in the classified civil service.

This order, which is for our own guidance in making these appointments, will bring an operation squaring with the requirements of any probable future legislation.

Under this order the kind of test and plan of investigation and examination which shall be provided for shall be approved by the President and shall be based on the applicant's business training, experience, fitness, organizing and executive ability, and general qualifications for an efficient administration, and shall in no sense be a cloistered, scholastic examination which might result in a high grade in theory but not a guaranty of efficiency in fact.

This order applies to all present incumbents of post offices whose terms have expired and will apply to all other incumbents as their present terms expire.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw the objection that I made to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOMPSON] extending his remarks in the RECORD on the post-office situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that some one page Mr. Burleson.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Army bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Army bill. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON. I object.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ELECT FRANKHAUSER.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, with deep regret I announce the death at Battle Creek, Mich., of WILLIAM H. FRANKHAUSER, Representative elect from the third congressional district of Michigan. Continued illness has prevented his taking his seat in the House. I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 86.

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM H. FRANKHAUSER, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly, in compliance with the resolution (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 11, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

118. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation changing the method of transferring to the civil service retirement and disability fund the deductions on account of employees paid from naval appropriations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

119. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of legislation to insure currency shipped by registered mail or parcel post to disbursing officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

120. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tentative draft of legislation to continue the appropriation contained in the fortification act for the fiscal year 1921 for necessary accommodations for the Seacoast Artillery and for temporary cantonments for oversea garrisons in the Philippine Islands until June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

121. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Librarian of Congress submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$20,000 required for printing and binding, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

122. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$92,000 required by the Department of State for contingent expenses, foreign missions, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. 81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

123. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a judgment rendered against the United States by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in favor of John B. Dahlgren in the sum of \$10,374.75, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from October 2, 1918, to date (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

124. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$15,956, heretofore transmitted to Congress and printed, with accompanying papers, in Senate Document No. 400, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

125. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$454.95, heretofore transmitted to Congress and printed, with accompanying papers, in Senate Document No. 389, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

126. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$315.44, heretofore transmitted to Congress and printed, with accompanying papers, in Senate Document No. 362, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.



## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 297) for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Dimonico; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4666) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Britton; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5785) granting a pension to Thaddeus M. Clarkson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6034) to prevent desecration of the flag and insignia of the United States, and to provide punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 6035) to amend the Federal farm loan act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6036) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 6037) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLASSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6038) to incorporate the Supreme Rendezvous, the Great Order of Knightly Kin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6039) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 6040) to amend section 19 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSSDALE: A bill (H. R. 6041) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6042) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6043) to amend paragraphs entitled "First" and "Second" of section 19a of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 6044) authorizing the Wichita and Affiliated Bands of Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6045) providing for the placing of Government employees engaged in the enforcement of national prohibition under the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6046) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6047) to establish in the Treasury Department a veterans' bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 6048) to encourage the development of the agricultural resources of the United States and the establishment of rural homes through Federal and State cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of such homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 6049) amending and extending the war risk insurance act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6050) to refer the claims of the Delaware Indians to the Court of Claims with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6051) to compensate the Delaware Indians for services rendered by them to the United States in various ways; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 6052) to appropriate money to pay stationary engineers and others in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 6053) to amend section 955 of the Revised Statutes by extending the jurisdiction of courts in cases of revivor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) for the relief of certain persons employed in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ARENTZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan cots and blankets for the use of the American Legion at the encampment to be held the latter part of July, 1921, at Lake Tahoe, Nev.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KISSEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIXLER: A bill (H. R. 6054) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of North Warren, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6055) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marienville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6056) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Wheatland, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6057) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Pleasantville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6058) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Jackson Center, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6059) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Columbus, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6060) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Sugar Grove, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6061) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Jamestown, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6062) granting a pension to Minnie Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 6063) granting a pension to Cora May Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6064) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Copan, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6065) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Vinita, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6066) granting a pension to Angeline Bissel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 6067) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Forty Fort, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6068) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wyoming, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ashley, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6070) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Freeland, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6071) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dallas, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6072) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dorranceton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6073) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kingston, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6074) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plymouth, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Exeter, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6077) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hazleton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6078) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Pittston, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Nanticoke, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 6080) granting a pension to M. Isabel Peirce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6081) to place the name of Thomas W. Purcell upon the Army and Navy medal of honor roll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6082) granting a pension to Louisa Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6083) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Setauket, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Freeport, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6085) for the relief of the heirs of William Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6086) granting an increase of pension to Mary Driscoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 6087) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Brafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. LEE of New York: A bill (H. R. 6088) for the relief of A. W. Duckett & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUHRING: A bill (H. R. 6089) granting an increase of pension to Melissa F. Proctor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6090) granting a pension to Jennie E. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 6091) granting an increase of pension to Agnes B. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 6092) granting a pension to Agnes L. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6093) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holland, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6094) for the relief of Moses Chauncey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 6095) granting a pension to Christina Pabst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6096) granting a pension to Amanda T. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHAELSON: A bill (H. R. 6097) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Park Ridge, State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6098) granting a pension to Anson A. Hungerford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 6099) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Waterford, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSEN: A bill (H. R. 6100) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morris Park, Long Island, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Woodhaven, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROSSDALE: A bill (H. R. 6102) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to Charles T. Winans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 6103) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corry, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6104) granting a pension to Mary A. Lavery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrison, State of New Jersey, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 6106) granting the distinguished service cross to Charles A. Musgrave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6107) granting a pension to Willis H. Dinan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6108) to permit the correction of the general account of Charles B. Strecker, former assistant treasurer United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYSON: A bill (H. R. 6109) providing for the retirement of Letitia Christian Tyler; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

577. By Mr. ARENTZ: Petition of the Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion, Capitol Post, No. 4, Carson City, Nev., and the Reno Central Trades and Labor Council, Reno, Nev., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

578. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Merle Reed Post, No. 124, American Legion, Delano, Calif., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

579. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of W. J. Johnson, Palestine, Tex., opposing the proposed sales tax, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

580. Also, petition of Galveston Council, No. 787, Knights of Columbus, urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

581. By Mr. COCKRAN: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging adequate quarantine facilities be provided, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

582. By Mr. COUGHLIN: Petition of the Women's Home Missionary Society of Plymouth, Pa., urging legislation prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

583. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 193, Utica, Mich., indorsing the program of legislation asked by the American Legion of the Sixty-seventh Congress in the interest of the disabled veterans of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

584. Also, telegrams from Hon. William C. Sanson, Wixson & Quinn, F. S. Riley, Hon. O. G. Johnson, F. C. Striffler, Lewis G. Seeley, H. S. Myers, and Hon. C. O. Blinn, Caro, Mich.; W. H. Cook, Akron, Mich.; F. A. Bach and W. M. Smith, Sebawaing, Mich.; and Amos L. Kinney, Silverwood, Mich., protesting against the proposed excise tax on sugar because of the serious effect of such a tax on the beet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

585. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of the congregations of all the churches of Old Cambridge, Mass., favoring international



conference to plan for the general limitation of armaments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

586. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

587. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the National Congress, Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Associations, Washington, D. C., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

588. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging adequate quarantine facilities, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

589. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Henry Reisdorf, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging higher rate on lithograph work, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

590. Also, petition of Capt. Patrick McAllister, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. Also, petition of Daniel and May McAuley, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

592. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Kelly, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

593. By Mr. KNIGHT: Petition of citizens of the fourteenth district of the State of Ohio, against any revision of the tariff on those classes of coal-tar products that are used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

594. Also, petition of citizens of Elyria and other Ohio cities, for suspension of immigration; also for the enactment of permanent legislation that will suspend immigration for a period of three years, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

595. Also, petition of the Burkhardt Co., the Akron Beverage & Cold Storage Co., and the Renner Products Co., all of the city of Akron, Ohio, urging the repeal of the internal revenue on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

596. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of the East Buffalo Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen against the sales tax, also for the repeal of the excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

597. Also, petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., and elsewhere, urging the passage of the bill introduced by Mr. MACGREGOR for duty on canary birds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

598. Also, petition of the Women's Auxillary, Tusculana Post No. 174, Buffalo, N. Y., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

599. By Mr. PARRISH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Vernon, Tex., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

600. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of citizens of the eleventh congressional district of New York, urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

601. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of citizens of the fifth district of the State of Massachusetts, urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

602. By Mr. SNELL: Resolutions of the American Legion, Plattsburgh Post No. 20, Plattsburgh, N. Y., for relief of disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

603. Also, resolution of Russell B. Childs Post No. 769, Chazy, N. Y., for the relief of the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

604. By Mr. SPEAKS: Papers to accompany H. R. 6005, granting a pension to Frank P. Lilley; to the Committee on Pensions.

605. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of citizens of the eleventh congressional district of the State of Massachusetts, urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

606. Also, petition of the Pilgrim Publicity Association, Boston, Mass., urging legislation for the protection of the coal-tar dye industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

607. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the one hundred and thirty-sixth convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Pennsylvania, urging international agreement for disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

608. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of the Women's Club of Huntington, W. Va., favoring national censorship of the picture shows; to the Committee on Education.

609. Also, petition of classes of the West Liberty State Normal School, West Liberty, W. Va., favoring the passage of House bill 7; to the Committee on Education.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 11, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, May 9, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Broussard	Hale	McCumber	Robinson
Calder	Harrison	McLean	Sheppard
Cameron	Johnson	McNary	Shortridge
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smoot
Cataway	Kellogg	Nelson	Spencer
Colt	Kendrick	New	Wadsworth
Curtis	Keyes	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	King	Oddie	Williams
Ernst	Knox	Overman	Willis
Gooding	La Follette	Penrose	

Mr. MOSES. I wish to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STELLING] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are 39 Senators present, not a quorum. The Secretary will call the absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. NEWBERRY, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names when called.

Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HARRELD, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. NICHOLSON, Mr. BALL, Mr. DIAL, and Mr. STERLING entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is absent attending the funeral of Col. Bertram Clayton, who died overseas.

I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. WATSON of Georgia, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. EDGE, Mr. BORAH, Mr. BURSUM, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. SHIELDS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## SUBMARINE TORPEDO BOATS.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, on yesterday I offered an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the naval appropriation bill. I have a communication from parties engaged in the manufacture of the Lake torpedo boat in support of that amendment. It is a very important industry located in Connecticut, and unless the amendment is agreed to the plant will have to close and some 2,000 men will be thrown out of employment. I ask unanimous consent that the communication may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE LAKE TORPEDO BOAT CO.,  
Bridgeport, Conn., U. S. A., May 7, 1921.

[Amending naval bill 4803, to permit construction of six fleet submarines under the 1916 naval program.]

Senator GEORGE P. McLEAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: 1. The Lake Torpedo Boat Co., of Bridgeport, Conn., requests you to offer an amendment to H. R. 4803, page 51, as follows: After the word "that," in line 25, insert the following: "with the exception of submarine torpedo boats," and to cause the same to be voted upon by the Senate.

2. A favorable vote will permit the Navy Department to proceed with the construction of the six fleet submarines authorized by the 1916 naval program. A negative vote will suspend the construction of the six fleet submarines.

The net result will be that we will be obliged to close our shipyard and disband our force if the vote is negative. We desire this question to be definitely settled by Congress. We consider the subject one of national importance, because our plant is a specialty devoted exclusively to the construction of submarines for the United States Navy. It can not be readily revived in any national emergency.

It has taken 20 years to organize and perfect our force of some 75 engineers and draftsmen and 1,200 skilled mechanics. Over \$2,000,000 of private money has been invested in the development of the Lake type submarine and the Bridgeport specialty plant, which is the only one of its kind in the world.

It consists of some 23 acres of land, with about three-quarters of a mile of water front, 15 building slips, 25 buildings, 1 wet basin, and 1 marine railway.